# Give Back the Land 1AC

## GBTL K Version

#### Educational spaces are not neutral – they can either be unique sites for creating change or can reproduce settler colonialism. To create an emancipatory educational space, we must develop a critical consciousness against colonialism. Thus, the role of the ballot is to engage in Red Pedagogy, and affirm the best methodology for deconstructing settler colonialism.

Grande 04**[[1]](#footnote-1)**

As we raise yet another generation in a nation at war, **it is** even more **imperative for schools to be reimagined as sites for social transformation and emancipation**; as **a place** "**where students** are educated not only to be critical thinkers, but also to **view the world as a place where their actions might make a difference**" (McLaren 2003). More specifically, McLaren outlines the es- sential elements of a post-9/11 critical pedagogy: (1) to support the broader societal aim of freedom of speech; (2) to be willing to challenge the Bush ad- ministration's definition of "patriotism"; (3) to examine the linkages between government and transnational corporations; (4) to commit to critical self- reflexivity and dialogue in public conversations; (5) to enforce the separation between church and state; (6) to struggle for a media that does not serve cor- porate interests; and, above all, (7) to commit to understanding the funda- mental basis of Marx's critique of capitalism (McLaren 2003) Indeed, in a time when the forces of free-market politics conspire not only to maintain the march of colonialism but also to dismantle (i.e., privatize) public education, such aims are essential. In addition to these immediate concerns, the frameworks of revolutionary critical theory provide indigenous educators and scholars a way to think about the issues of sovereignty and self-determination that moves beyond simple cultural constructions and analyses. Specifically, their foregrounding of cap- italist relations as the axis of exploitation helps to frame the history of in- digenous peoples as one of dispossession and not simply oppression. Their trenchant critique of postmodernism helps to reveal the "problem" of identity (social representation) as a distraction from the need for social transforma- tion. Similarly, the work of revolutionary critical feminists helps to explain how gendered differences have been systematically produced and continue to operate within regimes of exploitation. In all these ways, the analyses of rev- olutionary critical pedagogy prove invaluable. As discussed in previous chapters, however, there are also ways in which the analysis of revolutionary theorists fails to consider their own enmesh- ment with the Western paradigm. Specifically, the notion of "democratiza- tion" remains rooted in Western concepts of property; the radical constructs of identity remain tied to Western notions of citizenship; the analyses of Marxist-feminists retain Western notions of subjectivity and gender; and revolutionary conceptions of the "ecological crisis" presume the "finished project" of colonization. Such aporias of revolutionary critical pedagogy, however, must not be viewed as deficiencies. Rather, they should be theorized as points of tension, helping to define the spaces in-between the Western and indigenous thought-worlds. Rev- olutionary scholars themselves acknowledge "no theory can fully anticipate or account for the consequences of its application but remains a living aperture through which specific histories are made visible and. intelligible" (McLaren and Farahmandpur 2001, 301). In other words no theory can, or should be, every- thing to all peoples—difference in the material domain necessitates difference in discursive fields. Therefore, while revolutionary critical theory can serve as a vi- tal tool for indigenous educators and scholars, **the basis of Red pedagogy [is] re- mains distinctive, rooted in indigenous knowledge and praxis**. Though a "tradition-based" revitalization project, **Red pedagogy does not aim to reproduce an essentialist** or romanticized **view of "tradition**." As sev- eral indigenous scholars have noted (e.g., Alfred, Deloria, Mihesuah, Warrior) the "return to tradition" is often a specious enterprise. In contradistinction to essentialist models of "tradition," Taiaiake Alfred suggests a model of "self- conscious traditionalism" for indigenous communities. He defines "self- conscious traditionalism" as an intellectual, social, and political movement to reinvigorate indigenous values, principles, and other cultural elements best suited to the larger contemporary political and economic reality (Alfred 1999, 81). In this context, tradition is not simply "predicated upon a set of uniform, unchanging beliefs" but rather is expressed as a *commitment* to the future sus- tainability of the group (Warrior 1995, xx). In other words, the struggle for freedom is not about "dressing up in the trappings of the past and making de- mands" but about being firmly rooted in "the ever changing experiences of the community." As such, **the process of defining a Red pedagogy is** neces- sarily **ongoing and self-reflexive**— a never-ending project that is continually informed by the work of critical and indigenous scholars and by the changing realities of indigenous peoples. Though the process is continual, **the overarching goal** of Red pedagogy **is** stable. It is, and will always remain, **decolonization**. "**Decolonization**" (like democracy) **is** neither achievable nor definable, rendering it ephemeral as a goal, but **perpetual as a process**. That is not to say, however, that "progress" cannot be measured. Indeed, **the degree to which indigenous peoples are able to define and exercise political, intellectual, and spiritual sovereignty is an accurate measure of colonialist relations**. **The dream of sovereignty** in all of these realms, thus, **forms the foundation of Red pedagogy**. As such, indige- nous responses o the international, transnational, postcolonial question are discussed in terms of Lyons's quest for a "nation-people," and Alfred's ( 1999) model for self-determined and self-directed communities. **[Continued…]** In the words of Peter McLaren, "one of the first casualties of war is truth." History, in other words, belongs to the victors (McLaren 2003, 289). Perhaps no one understands this better than indigenous peoples who, in addition to suffering the depredations of genocide, colonization, and cultural annihila- tion, have been revictimized at the hands of whitestream history. The lesson here is pedagogical. The imperative before us, as educators, is to ensure that we engage a thorough examination of the causes and effects of all wars, conflicts, and inter/ intracultural encounters. We must engage the best of our creative and critical capacities to discern the path of social justice and then follow it. **The ongoing injustices of the world call educators-as-students-as-activists to work together—to be in solidarity as we work to change the history of empire and struggle in the** common **project of decolonization**. To do so requires courage, humility, and love *(muna).* Moreover, revolutionary scholars remind us that "our struggle must not stop at calling for better wages and living conditions for teachers and other workers but must anticipate an alternative to capitalism that will bring about a better chance for democracy to live up to its promise" (McLaren 2003, 290). Though the promise of democracy has always been specious for American In- dians, the notion of an anticapitalist society has not. Indigenous peoples con- tinue to present such an alter-native vision, persisting in their lived experience of collectivity and connection to land, both of which vehemently defy capi- talist desire. **Red pedagogy is the manifestation of sovereignty, engaging the devel- opment of "community-based power"** in the interest of "a responsible po-itical, economic, and spiritual society"12 (Richardson and Villenas 2000, 272). Power in this context refers to the practice of "living out active pres- ences and *survivances* rather than an illusionary democracy"( Richardson and Villenas 2000, 273). As articulated by Vizenor, the notion of ***survivance* signifies a state of being beyond** "**survival**, endurance, or a mere response to colonization," **toward** "an active presence . . . and **active repu- diation of dominance**, tragedy and victimry"(Vizenor 1998, 15). The ***survivance* narratives** of indigenous peoples are those that **articulate the active** recovery, **reimagination, and reinvestment of indigenous ways of being**. **These narratives assert the struggles of indigenous peoples and the lived reality of colonization as** a **complexity** that extends far beyond the param- eters of economic capitalist oppression. Survivance narratives form the basis of a Red pedagogy. They compel it to move beyond romantic calls to an imagined past toward the development of a viable, competing moral vision. Specifically, **a Red pedagogy implores our conversations about power to include an examination of responsibility**, to consider our collective need "to live poorer and waste less." It implores strug- gles for human rights to move beyond the anthropocentric discourse of humans-only and to fetter battles for "voice" with an appreciation for silence. In the end a **Red pedagogy embraces an educative process that works to reenchant the universe, to reconnect peoples to the land**, and is as much about be- lief and acquiescence as it is about questioning and empowerment. In so do- ing, **it defines a viable space for tradition, rather than working to "rupture" our connections to it**. The hope is that **such a pedagogy will help shape** schoolsand processes of **learning around the "decolonial imaginary."** Within this fourth space of being, **the dream is that indigenous and nonindigenous peoples will work in solidarity to envision a way of life free of exploitation and replete with spirit**. **The invitation is** for scholars, educators, and students **to exercise critical con- sciousness at the same time they recognize that the world of knowledge far exceeds our ability to know**. **It beckons all of us to acknowledge that only the mountain commands reverence, the bird freedom of thought, and the land comprehension of time**. With this spirit in mind, I proceed on my own jour- ney to learn, to teach, and to be.

#### The United States government justifies nuclear colonialism on Indigenous lands without taking into account the effects on already impoverished indigenous communities and exploits poor conditions the continue the war against Indigenous people.

**Endres 09[[2]](#footnote-2)**

Before attending to the rhetorical nature of nuclear colonialism, it is important to emphasize the scope and material effects of nuclear technologies on indigenous peoples and their lands. This is a history of systematic exploitation and indigenous resistance, spanning from the 1940s to present. As the Indigenous Environmental Network writes, **the nuclear industry has waged** an undeclared **war against** our **Indigenous peoples** and Pacific Islanders that has poisoned our communities worldwide. For more than 50 years, the legacy of the nuclear chain, fromexploration to the dumping of **radioactive waste has been proven**, through documentation, **to be genocide and ethnocide** and a deadly enemy of Indigenous peoples. ... United States federal law and nuclear **policy** has not protected Indigenous peoples, and in fact **has** **been created to allow the nuclear industry to continue operations at the expense of our land,** territory, **health and traditional ways of life**. ... This disproportionate toxic burden\*called **environmental racism**\***has culminated in** the current **attempts to dump** much of the nation’s **nuclear waste in the homelands of the Indigenous peoples** of the Great Basin region of the United States.4 From an indigenous perspective, **the material consequences of nuclear colonialism have affected the vitality of indigenous peoples**. This can be seen clearly in both uranium mining and nuclear testing. **Uranium mining is inextricably linked with indigenous peoples**. According to LaDuke, ‘‘some 70 percent of the world’s uranium originates from Native Communities.’’5 Within the US, approximately 66 percent of the known uranium deposits are on reservation land, as much as 80 percent are on treaty-guaranteed land, and up to 90 percent of uranium mining and milling occurs on or adjacent to American Indian land.6 To support the federal government’s desire for nuclear weapons and power production, the Bureau of Indians Affairs (BIA) has worked in collusion with the Atomic Energy Commission and corporations such as Kerr-McGee and United Nuclear to negotiate leases with Navajo, Lakota and other nations for uranium mining and milling on their land between the 1950s to the present.7 BIAnegotiated leases are supported by the complex body of Indian Law, which I will demonstrate enables federal intrusion into American Indian lands and governmental affairs. These leases are heavily tilted in favor of the corporations so that American Indian nations received only about 3.4 percent of the market value of the uranium and low paid jobs.8 **Uranium mining has also resulted in severe health and environmental legacies for** affected **American Indian people and their lands**. From uranium mining on Navajo land, there have been at least 450 reported cancer deaths among Navajo mining employees.9 Even now, **the legacy of over 1000 abandoned mines and uranium tailing piles is radioactive dust that continues to put people living near tailing piles at a high risk for lung cancer**.10 The history of exploitation and resistance continues with nuclear weapons production. As nuclear engineer Arjun Makhijani argues, ‘‘all too often such damage has been done to ethnic minorities or on colonial lands or both. The main sites for testing nuclear weapons for every declared nuclear power are on tribal or minority lands.’’11 From 1951 to 1992, over 900 nuclear weapons tests were conducted on the Nevada Test Site (NTS)\*land claimed by the Western Shoshone under the 1863 Treaty of Ruby Valley. The late Western Shoshone spiritual leader Corbin Harney proclaimed Western Shoshone to be ‘‘the most nuclear bombed nation in the world.’’12 According to Western Shoshone Virginia Sanchez, indigenous people may have suffered more radiation exposure because of their land-linked lifestyle of ‘‘picking berries, hunting and gathering our traditional foods,’’ resulting in ‘‘major doses of radiation.’’13 Yet, the federal government and legal system have made only token gestures toward compensating victims of nuclear testing. The Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (RECA) has strict qualification guidelines that have excluded many downwinders from receiving compensation.14 In addition to the effects on human health from nuclear testing, there is also an environmental toll through contaminated soil and water, which could harm animal and plant life.15 American Indian resistance is an important part of the story of nuclear colonialism. Despite the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act’s limitations, American Indian activists were instrumental in getting it passed. In response to discussion of renewed uranium mining in the US to support new nuclear reactors, the Navajo nation banned uranium mining and the Lakota nation successfully prevented corporate exploration of potential uranium mines on the Pine Ridge reservation.16 The Western Shoshone actively resisted nuclear testing from the 1980s to 1992 and challenged recent proposals that may portend renewed testing at the NTS. Every May, the Shundahai Network sponsors a Mother’s Day event at the Nevada test site, which culminates in a direct action to assert Western Shoshone land rights. Furthermore, resistance from Western Shoshone people and Utah downwinders forced the cancellation of a non-nuclear sub-critical test (Divine Strake) proposed for the NTS in June 2006. Now, with over 60 years of uranium mining, nuclear weapons production and nuclear power, we face a high-level nuclear waste crisis. Once again, power brokers have looked to exploit American Indian lands, resources and peoples. **In the** twentyyear **process of** researching and **authorizing a federal** high-level **nuclear waste repository site, only sites on [Indigenous]** American Indian **land were seriously considered**. In addition to the Yucca Mountain site, American Indian nations were also targeted for temporary waste storage through the now-defunct Monitored Retrievable Storage (MRS) program.17 And recently, a proposal by Private Fuel Storage (PFS) and the Skull Valley Goshutes to temporarily store nuclear waste at Skull Valley Goshute reservation was defeated by Skull Valley activists working with the State of Utah against the Skull Valley government and PFS.18 The struggle over the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste site is, as Kuletz pointed out, a continuation of struggles against nuclear colonialism: ‘‘Indian protests over the use of Yucca Mountain as a high-level nuclearwaste dump cannot be seen as an anomaly. Rather, they are a part of a persistent pattern of resistance to military occupation and nuclear activity.’’19 Although we do not yet know the health and environmental effects of permanent nuclear waste storage, nuclear colonialism is not just about health and environmental devastation. It also intersects with sovereignty, nuclearism and colonialism, to which I now turn.

#### **Indigenous sovereignty only ever exists in relation to the USFG recognizing it – USFG control is always a reinstatement of colonial sovereignty— The autonomy of Indigenous nations must be the central goal in deconstructing the settler mode of thought.**

Lopez 04**[[3]](#footnote-3)**

The issue of nuclear waste has played a key role in obscuring the definition of Native American sovereignty. **Although sovereignty is a simple concept, contradictory government policies have skewed its definition** and made it a sticky subject for even the politically astute to comprehend. **By turning their nose up at treaties and claiming [Indigenous]** Native American **land as their property for nuclear testing and radioactive waste dumping, the government has blown** gaping **holes into** Native American **sovereignty rights**. Sadly, **the government’s view on sovereignty is that “**.**a**n Indian **Tribe is sovereign to the extent that the United States permits it to be sovereign.”** (United States v. Blackfeet Tribe, 1973). **No [Indigenous]** Native American **nation can be a truly autonomous entity if the United States government can choose when they wish to give them sovereignty.smith**

#### Thus, we affirm the resolution as an embrace of the politics of impossible – we demand a world in which we kick the US and its nuclear plants off the planet.

#### Imagining a world where we kick the US off the planet and give back the land is a necessary resistance strategy. Prioritization is key.

Churchill 96[[4]](#footnote-4) Bracketed for language

**The question which inevitably arises with regard to indigenous land claims, especially in the United States, is whether they are "realistic." The answer, of course, is, "No, they aren't." Further,** no form of decolonization has ever been realistic when viewed within the construct of a colonialist paradigm. It wasn't realistic at the time to expect George Washington's rag-tag militia to defeat the British military during the American Revolution. Just ask the British. It wasn't realistic, as the French could tell you, that **the Vietnamese** should be able to defeat U.S.-backed France in 1954, or that **the Algerians** would shortly be able to follow in their footsteps. Surely, it wasn't reasonable to predict that Fidel Castro's pitiful handful of guerrillas would overcome Batista's regime in Cuba, another U.S. client, after only a few years in the mountains. And **the** S**andinist**as, to be sure, **had no prayer of attaining victory** over Somoza 20 years later. Henry Kissinger, among others, knew that for a fact. The point is that in each case, in order to begin their struggles at all, anti-colonial fighters around the world havehad to abandon orthodox realism in favor of what they knew (and their opponents knew) to be right. To paraphrase Daniel Cohn-Bendit, they accepted as their agenda-the goals, objectives, and demands which guided them-**a redefinition of reality in terms deemed quite impossible within the conventional wisdom of their oppressors**. And, in each case, they succeeded in their immediate quest for liberation.202 The fact that all but one (Cuba) of the examples used subsequently turned out to hold colonizing pretensions of its own does not alter the truth of this-or alter the appropriateness of their efforts to decolonize themselves-in the least. It simply means that decolonization has yet to run its course, that much remains to be done. The battles waged by native nations in North America to free themselves, and the lands upon which they depend for ongoing existence as discernible peoples, from the grip of U.S. (and Canadian) internal colonialism are plainly part of this process of liberation. Given that their very survival depends upon their perseverance in the face of all apparent odds, American Indians [Indigenous peoples] have no real alternative but to carry on. They must struggle, and where there is struggle there is always hope. Moreover, the unrealistic or "romantic" dimensions of our aspiration to quite literally dismantle the territorial corpus of the U.S. state begin to erode when one considers that federal domination of [Indigenous] Native North America is utterly contingent upon maintenance of a perceived confluence of interests between prevailing governmental/ corporate elites and common non-Indian citizens. Herein lies the prospect of long-term success. It is entirely possible that the consensus of opinion concerning non-Indian "rights" to exploit the land and resources of indigenous nations can be eroded, and that large numbers of non-Indians will join in the struggle to decolonize Native North America. Few non-Indians wish to identify with or defend the naziesque characteristics of US. history. To the contrary, most seek to deny it in rather vociferous fashion. All things being equal, they are uncomfortable with many of the resulting attributes of federal posture and-in substantial numbers-actively oppose one or more of these, so long as such politics do not intrude into a certain range of closely guarded self-interests. This is where the crunch comes in the realm of Indian rights issues. Most non-[Indigenous people] Indians (of all races and ethnicities, and both genders**)** have been indoctrinated to believe the officially contrived notion that, in the event "the [Indigenous people] Indians get their land back," or even if the extent of present federal domination is relaxed, native [Indigenous] people will do unto their occupiers exactly as has been done to them; mass dispossession and eviction of non-Indians, especially Euroamericans, is expected to ensue. Hence, even those progressives who are most eloquently inclined to condemn U.s. imperialism abroad and/ or the functions of racism and sexism at home tend to deliver a blank stare or profess open "disinterest" when indigenous land rights are mentioned. Instead of attempting to come to grips with this most fundamental of all issues on the continent upon which they reside, the more sophisticated among them seek to divert discussion into "higher priority" or "more important" topics like "issues of class and gender equity" in which "justice" becomes synonymous with a redistribution of power and loot deriving from the occupation of [Indigenous] Native North America even while the occupation continues (presumably permanently) . Sometimes, Indians are even slated to receive "their fair share" in the division of spoils accruing from expropriation of their resources. Always, such things are couched-and typically seen-in terms of some "greater good" than decolonizing the .6 percent of the U.S. population which is indigenous.203 Some marxist and environmentalist groups have taken the argument so far as to deny that Indians possess any rights distinguishable from those of their conquerors.204 AIM leader Russell Means snapped the picture into sharp focus when he observed in 1987 that: All that is needed is an honest, open, and binding forum-such as a new bilateral treaty process--with which to proceed. In fact, numerous native peoples have, for a long time, repeatedly and in a variety of ways, expressed a desire to participate in just such a process. • Nonetheless, it is argued, there will still be at least some non-Indians "trapped" within such restored areas. Actually, they would not be trapped at all The federally imposed genetic criteria of "Indian-ness" discussed elsewhere in this book notwithstanding, indigenous nations have the same rights as any other to define citizenry by allegiance (naturalization) rather than by race. Non-Indians could apply for citizenship, or for some form of landed alien status which would allow them to retain their property until they die. In the event they could not reconcile themselves to living under any jurisdiction other than that of the United States, they would obviously have the right to leave, and they should have the right to compensation from their own government (which got them into the mess in the first place).209 • Finally, and one suspects this is the real crux of things from the government/ corporate perspective, any such restoration of land and attendant sovereign prerogatives to native nations would result in a truly massive loss of "domestic" resources to the United States, thereby impairing the country's economic and military capacities (see "Radioactive Colonialism" essay for details). For everyone who queued up to wave flags and tie on yellow ribbons during the United States' recent imperial adventure in the Persian Gulf, this prospect may induce a certain psychic trauma. But, for progressives at least, it should be precisely the point. When you think about these issues in this way, the great mass of non-Indians in North America really have much to gain, and almost nothing to lost.:, from tilt.: success of native people in struggles to reclaim the land which is rightfully ours. The tangible diminishment of U.S. material power which is integral to our victories in this sphere stands to pave the way for realization of most other agendas-from anti-imperialism to environmentalism, from African-American liberation to feminism, from gay rights to the ending of class privilege pursued by progressives on this continent. Conversely, succeeding with any or even all these other agendas would still represent an inherently oppressive situation if their realization is contingent upon an ongoing occupation of Native North America without the consent of Indian people**.** Any North American revolution which failed to free indigenous territory from non-Indian domination would be simply a continu[e]ation of colonialism in another form. Regardless of the angle from which you view the matter, the liberation of Native North America, liberation of the land first and foremost, is the key to fundamental and positive social changes of many other sorts. One thing, as they say, leads to another. The question has always been, of course, which "thing" is to be first in the sequence. A preliminary formulation for those serious about achieving (rather than merely theorizing and endlessly debating) radical change in the United States might be "First Priority to First Americans." Put another way, this would mean, "U.S. Out of [Indigenous] Indian Country. " Inevitably, the logic leads to what we've all been so desperately seeking: the United States-at least as we've come to know it-out of North America altogether. From there, it can be permanently banished from the planet. In its stead, surely we can join hands to create something new and infinitely better. That's our vision of "impossible realism." Isn't it time we all went to work on attaining it?

#### The 1AC is not a demand for inclusion—it is a questioning of the system to which we are trying to include Indigenous bodies in the first place. Theories that try to make the USFG accessible to oppressed bodies only serves to justify assimilation

Grande 04 Sandy Grande “Red Pedagogy” 2004

Contemporary revolutionary **scholars critique liberal models of democracy** and education, **naming their "politics of inclusion' as an accomplice to** the broader project of **assimilation.** Specifically, they argue that **such models ignore the historic, economic, and material conditions of "difference,"** conspicuously **averting the whitestream gaze away from issues of power.** Critical scholars therefore maintain that **while liberal theorists may invest in** the "theoretical **idealism**" of democracy, **they remain** "**amnesiatic toward the** continued lived **realities of democratically induced oppression**" (Richardson and Villenas 2000, 260).

#### Indigenous land restoration is key to undermine the ability of the state to enforce its codes of Euroamerican centrality which is the root cause of all forms of oppression.

Churchill 2 WARD CHURCHILL, FORMER PROFESSOR OF ETHNIC STUDIES AT UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER 1996 “I AM NDIGENIST,” FROM A NATIVE SON PGS 520-30

Not only is it perfectly reasonable to assert that **a restoration of** Indian **[Indigenous] control over** unceded **lands within the United States** **would** do nothing to perpetuate such problems as sexism and classism, but the reconstitution of indigenous societies this would entail stands to free the affected portions of North America from such maladies altogether. Moreover, it can be said that the process should **have a tangible impact in terms of diminishing such oppressions elsewhere.** The principles is this: **sexism, racism, and all the rest arose here as a concomitant to the emergence and consolidation of the Eurocentric** nation-state **form of sociopolitical** and economic **organization. Everything the state does**, everything it can do, **is entirely contingent on its maintaining its internal cohesion**, a cohesion signified above all by its pretended territorial integrity, its ongoing domination of Indian Country. Given this, it seems obvious that **the literal dismemberment of the nation-state inherent to** Indian **[Indigenous] land recovery correspondingly reduces the ability of the state to sustain the imposition of objectionable relations within itself.** It follows that **realization of indigenous land rights serves to undermine or destroy the ability of the status quo to continue imposing a racist, sexist, classist, homophobic, militaristic order** on non-Indians.

#### Land is the only meaningful starting point – anything else is a palliative that was never seriously intended to change ANYTHING for colonized peoples – the violence of invasion is reasserted each day of occupation

Tuck and Fernandez 13**[[5]](#footnote-5)**

**Settler colonialism** is the specific formation of colonialism in which **the colonizer** **comes to stay, making** **himself [or herself]** the sovereign, and **the arbiter of citizenship**, civility, and knowing. Patrick Wolfe (2006) argues that settler colonialism “destroys to replace,” (p. 338) operating with a logic of elimination. “**Whatever settlers may say**—and they generally have a lot to say,” Wolfe observes, “**the primary motive for elimination is** not race (or religion, ethnicity, grade of civilization, etc.) but access to territory” (ibid., parentheses original). The logic of elimination is embedded into every aspect of the settler colonial structures and its disciplines—it is in their DNA, in a manner of speaking. Indeed **invasion is** a **structure, not an event** (p. 402). **The violence of invasion is not contained to first contact** or the unfortunate birthpangs of a new nation, **but is** reasserted each day of occupation. Thus, when we write about **settler colonialism** in this article, we are writing about it as **[is] both an historical** and **contemporary matrix of relations and conditions that define life in the settler colonial nation-state, such as the** United States, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, Israel, South Africa, Chinese Tibet, and others. In North America, **settler colonialism operates through a triad of relationships, between the** (white [but not always]) **settlers, the Indigenous inhabitants, and chattel slaves who are removed from their homelands to work stolen land.** At the crux of these relationships is land, highly valued and disputed. **For settlers to live on and profit from land, they must eliminate Indigenous peoples, and** extinguish their historical, epistemological, philosophical, moral and political claims to land. Land, in being settled, becomes property. **Settlers must also import chattel slaves, who must be kept landless**, and who also become property, to be used, abused, and managed.

## GBTL Framework Version

#### Educational spaces are not neutral – they can either be unique sites for creating change or can reproduce settler colonialism. To create an emancipatory educational space, we must develop a critical consciousness against colonialism. Thus, the role of the ballot is to affirm the best methodology for deconstructing settler colonialism.

Grande 04**[[6]](#footnote-6)**

As we raise yet another generation in a nation at war, **it is** even more **imperative for schools to be reimagined as sites for social transformation and emancipation**; as **a place** "**where students** are educated not only to be critical thinkers, but also to **view the world as a place where their actions might make a difference**" (McLaren 2003). More specifically, McLaren outlines the es- sential elements of a post-9/11 critical pedagogy: (1) to support the broader societal aim of freedom of speech; (2) to be willing to challenge the Bush ad- ministration's definition of "patriotism"; (3) to examine the linkages between government and transnational corporations; (4) to commit to critical self- reflexivity and dialogue in public conversations; (5) to enforce the separation between church and state; (6) to struggle for a media that does not serve cor- porate interests; and, above all, (7) to commit to understanding the funda- mental basis of Marx's critique of capitalism (McLaren 2003) Indeed, in a time when the forces of free-market politics conspire not only to maintain the march of colonialism but also to dismantle (i.e., privatize) public education, such aims are essential. In addition to these immediate concerns, the frameworks of revolutionary critical theory provide indigenous educators and scholars a way to think about the issues of sovereignty and self-determination that moves beyond simple cultural constructions and analyses. Specifically, their foregrounding of cap- italist relations as the axis of exploitation helps to frame the history of in- digenous peoples as one of dispossession and not simply oppression. Their trenchant critique of postmodernism helps to reveal the "problem" of identity (social representation) as a distraction from the need for social transforma- tion. Similarly, the work of revolutionary critical feminists helps to explain how gendered differences have been systematically produced and continue to operate within regimes of exploitation. In all these ways, the analyses of rev- olutionary critical pedagogy prove invaluable. As discussed in previous chapters, however, there are also ways in which the analysis of revolutionary theorists fails to consider their own enmesh- ment with the Western paradigm. Specifically, the notion of "democratiza- tion" remains rooted in Western concepts of property; the radical constructs of identity remain tied to Western notions of citizenship; the analyses of Marxist-feminists retain Western notions of subjectivity and gender; and revolutionary conceptions of the "ecological crisis" presume the "finished project" of colonization. Such aporias of revolutionary critical pedagogy, however, must not be viewed as deficiencies. Rather, they should be theorized as points of tension, helping to define the spaces in-between the Western and indigenous thought-worlds. Rev- olutionary scholars themselves acknowledge "no theory can fully anticipate or account for the consequences of its application but remains a living aperture through which specific histories are made visible and. intelligible" (McLaren and Farahmandpur 2001, 301). In other words no theory can, or should be, every- thing to all peoples—difference in the material domain necessitates difference in discursive fields. Therefore, while revolutionary critical theory can serve as a vi- tal tool for indigenous educators and scholars, **the basis of Red pedagogy [is] re- mains distinctive, rooted in indigenous knowledge and praxis**. Though a "tradition-based" revitalization project, **Red pedagogy does not aim to reproduce an essentialist** or romanticized **view of "tradition**." As sev- eral indigenous scholars have noted (e.g., Alfred, Deloria, Mihesuah, Warrior) the "return to tradition" is often a specious enterprise. In contradistinction to essentialist models of "tradition," Taiaiake Alfred suggests a model of "self- conscious traditionalism" for indigenous communities. He defines "self- conscious traditionalism" as an intellectual, social, and political movement to reinvigorate indigenous values, principles, and other cultural elements best suited to the larger contemporary political and economic reality (Alfred 1999, 81). In this context, tradition is not simply "predicated upon a set of uniform, unchanging beliefs" but rather is expressed as a *commitment* to the future sus- tainability of the group (Warrior 1995, xx). In other words, the struggle for freedom is not about "dressing up in the trappings of the past and making de- mands" but about being firmly rooted in "the ever changing experiences of the community." As such, **the process of defining a Red pedagogy is** neces- sarily **ongoing and self-reflexive**— a never-ending project that is continually informed by the work of critical and indigenous scholars and by the changing realities of indigenous peoples. Though the process is continual, **the overarching goal** of Red pedagogy **is** stable. It is, and will always remain, **decolonization**. "**Decolonization**" (like democracy) **is** neither achievable nor definable, rendering it ephemeral as a goal, but **perpetual as a process**. That is not to say, however, that "progress" cannot be measured. Indeed, **the degree to which indigenous peoples are able to define and exercise political, intellectual, and spiritual sovereignty is an accurate measure of colonialist relations**. **The dream of sovereignty** in all of these realms, thus, **forms the foundation of Red pedagogy**. As such, indige- nous responses o the international, transnational, postcolonial question are discussed in terms of Lyons's quest for a "nation-people," and Alfred's ( 1999) model for self-determined and self-directed communities. **[Continued…]** In the words of Peter McLaren, "one of the first casualties of war is truth." History, in other words, belongs to the victors (McLaren 2003, 289). Perhaps no one understands this better than indigenous peoples who, in addition to suffering the depredations of genocide, colonization, and cultural annihila- tion, have been revictimized at the hands of whitestream history. The lesson here is pedagogical. The imperative before us, as educators, is to ensure that we engage a thorough examination of the causes and effects of all wars, conflicts, and inter/ intracultural encounters. We must engage the best of our creative and critical capacities to discern the path of social justice and then follow it. **The ongoing injustices of the world call educators-as-students-as-activists to work together—to be in solidarity as we work to change the history of empire and struggle in the** common **project of decolonization**. To do so requires courage, humility, and love *(muna).* Moreover, revolutionary scholars remind us that "our struggle must not stop at calling for better wages and living conditions for teachers and other workers but must anticipate an alternative to capitalism that will bring about a better chance for democracy to live up to its promise" (McLaren 2003, 290). Though the promise of democracy has always been specious for American In- dians, the notion of an anticapitalist society has not. Indigenous peoples con- tinue to present such an alter-native vision, persisting in their lived experience of collectivity and connection to land, both of which vehemently defy capi- talist desire. **Red pedagogy is the manifestation of sovereignty, engaging the devel- opment of "community-based power"** in the interest of "a responsible po-itical, economic, and spiritual society"12 (Richardson and Villenas 2000, 272). Power in this context refers to the practice of "living out active pres- ences and *survivances* rather than an illusionary democracy"( Richardson and Villenas 2000, 273). As articulated by Vizenor, the notion of ***survivance* signifies a state of being beyond** "**survival**, endurance, or a mere response to colonization," **toward** "an active presence . . . and **active repu- diation of dominance**, tragedy and victimry"(Vizenor 1998, 15). The ***survivance* narratives** of indigenous peoples are those that **articulate the active** recovery, **reimagination, and reinvestment of indigenous ways of being**. **These narratives assert the struggles of indigenous peoples and the lived reality of colonization as** a **complexity** that extends far beyond the param- eters of economic capitalist oppression. Survivance narratives form the basis of a Red pedagogy. They compel it to move beyond romantic calls to an imagined past toward the development of a viable, competing moral vision. Specifically, **a Red pedagogy implores our conversations about power to include an examination of responsibility**, to consider our collective need "to live poorer and waste less." It implores strug- gles for human rights to move beyond the anthropocentric discourse of humans-only and to fetter battles for "voice" with an appreciation for silence. In the end a **Red pedagogy embraces an educative process that works to reenchant the universe, to reconnect peoples to the land**, and is as much about be- lief and acquiescence as it is about questioning and empowerment. In so do- ing, **it defines a viable space for tradition, rather than working to "rupture" our connections to it**. The hope is that **such a pedagogy will help shape** schoolsand processes of **learning around the "decolonial imaginary."** Within this fourth space of being, **the dream is that indigenous and nonindigenous peoples will work in solidarity to envision a way of life free of exploitation and replete with spirit**. **The invitation is** for scholars, educators, and students **to exercise critical con- sciousness at the same time they recognize that the world of knowledge far exceeds our ability to know**. **It beckons all of us to acknowledge that only the mountain commands reverence, the bird freedom of thought, and the land comprehension of time**. With this spirit in mind, I proceed on my own jour- ney to learn, to teach, and to be.

#### Current debate practices normalize settler colonialism by absorbing indigenous thought into white supremacy, perpetuating the ongoing colonial project and ontological exclusion of Indigenous voices – embrace alternative understandings of the resolution.

Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernandez 13**[[7]](#footnote-7)**

Natty Bumppo, not savage, and no longer European, is positioned to claim “native status,” symbolically taking the place of “the last of the mohicans” and of all the other vanishing tribes. The figure of the frontiers man who is one with nature saturates the U.S. cultural imaginary, from the Adirondack backwoodsman and the Order of the Arrow of the Boy Scouts of America (Alonso Recarte, 2010), to Kevin Costner’s Dances with Wolves and the most recent expression of the White settler-becoming-Indian, Johnny Depp’s characterization of Tonto. Natty Bumppo also resurfaces within the contentions over colonization and race that mar the politics of progressive fields such as curriculum studies. Here, the future of the settler is ensured **by the** absorption of any and all critiques that pose a challenge to white supremacy, **and** **the** replacement of anyone who dares to speak against ongoing colonization. This article does the simultaneously blunt and delicate work of exhuming the ways in which curriculum and its history in the United States **has invested in settler colonialism, and** the permanence of the settler-colonial nation state. In particular, we will describe **the settler colonial curricular project of replacement, which aims to** vanish Indigenous peoples and replace them with settlers**, who see themselves as the rightful claimants to land, and indeed, as indigenous**. To do this, we employ the story of Natty Bumppo, as an extended allegory to understand the ways in which **the field of curriculum has continued to** absorb, silence, and replace the non-white other, perpetuating white supremacy and settlerhood. As we discuss in this article, **even as multiple responses have evolved to counter how curriculum continues to enforce colonization and racism, these responses become** refracted and adjusted to be absorbed by the whitestream, like the knowledge gained by Natty Bumppo, **only to turn to the source and accuse them of savagery, today through a rhetorical move against identity politics**. White curriculum scholars re-occupy the “spaces” **opened by responses to racism and colonization in** **the curriculum**, such as multiculturalism and critical race theory, absorbing the knowledge, but once again displacing the bodies out to the margins. Thus, we will discuss how various **interventions have** tried to dislodge **the aims of replacement**, including multiculturalism, critical race theory, and browning, but **have been** sidelined and reappropriated **in ways that** reinscribe settler colonialism and settler futurity.

#### The United States government justifies nuclear colonialism on Indigenous lands without taking into account the effects on already impoverished indigenous communities and exploits poor conditions the continue the war against Indigenous people.

**Endres 09[[8]](#footnote-8)**

Before attending to the rhetorical nature of nuclear colonialism, it is important to emphasize the scope and material effects of nuclear technologies on indigenous peoples and their lands. This is a history of systematic exploitation and indigenous resistance, spanning from the 1940s to present. As the Indigenous Environmental Network writes, **the nuclear industry has waged** an undeclared **war against** our **Indigenous peoples** and Pacific Islanders that has poisoned our communities worldwide. For more than 50 years, the legacy of the nuclear chain, fromexploration to the dumping of **radioactive waste has been proven**, through documentation, **to be genocide and ethnocide** and a deadly enemy of Indigenous peoples. ... United States federal law and nuclear **policy** has not protected Indigenous peoples, and in fact **has** **been created to allow the nuclear industry to continue operations at the expense of our land,** territory, **health and traditional ways of life**. ... This disproportionate toxic burden\*called **environmental racism**\***has culminated in** the current **attempts to dump** much of the nation’s **nuclear waste in the homelands of the Indigenous peoples** of the Great Basin region of the United States.4 From an indigenous perspective, **the material consequences of nuclear colonialism have affected the vitality of indigenous peoples**. This can be seen clearly in both uranium mining and nuclear testing. **Uranium mining is inextricably linked with indigenous peoples**. According to LaDuke, ‘‘some 70 percent of the world’s uranium originates from Native Communities.’’5 Within the US, approximately 66 percent of the known uranium deposits are on reservation land, as much as 80 percent are on treaty-guaranteed land, and up to 90 percent of uranium mining and milling occurs on or adjacent to American Indian land.6 To support the federal government’s desire for nuclear weapons and power production, the Bureau of Indians Affairs (BIA) has worked in collusion with the Atomic Energy Commission and corporations such as Kerr-McGee and United Nuclear to negotiate leases with Navajo, Lakota and other nations for uranium mining and milling on their land between the 1950s to the present.7 BIAnegotiated leases are supported by the complex body of Indian Law, which I will demonstrate enables federal intrusion into American Indian lands and governmental affairs. These leases are heavily tilted in favor of the corporations so that American Indian nations received only about 3.4 percent of the market value of the uranium and low paid jobs.8 **Uranium mining has also resulted in severe health and environmental legacies for** affected **American Indian people and their lands**. From uranium mining on Navajo land, there have been at least 450 reported cancer deaths among Navajo mining employees.9 Even now, **the legacy of over 1000 abandoned mines and uranium tailing piles is radioactive dust that continues to put people living near tailing piles at a high risk for lung cancer**.10 The history of exploitation and resistance continues with nuclear weapons production. As nuclear engineer Arjun Makhijani argues, ‘‘all too often such damage has been done to ethnic minorities or on colonial lands or both. The main sites for testing nuclear weapons for every declared nuclear power are on tribal or minority lands.’’11 From 1951 to 1992, over 900 nuclear weapons tests were conducted on the Nevada Test Site (NTS)\*land claimed by the Western Shoshone under the 1863 Treaty of Ruby Valley. The late Western Shoshone spiritual leader Corbin Harney proclaimed Western Shoshone to be ‘‘the most nuclear bombed nation in the world.’’12 According to Western Shoshone Virginia Sanchez, indigenous people may have suffered more radiation exposure because of their land-linked lifestyle of ‘‘picking berries, hunting and gathering our traditional foods,’’ resulting in ‘‘major doses of radiation.’’13 Yet, the federal government and legal system have made only token gestures toward compensating victims of nuclear testing. The Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (RECA) has strict qualification guidelines that have excluded many downwinders from receiving compensation.14 In addition to the effects on human health from nuclear testing, there is also an environmental toll through contaminated soil and water, which could harm animal and plant life.15 American Indian resistance is an important part of the story of nuclear colonialism. Despite the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act’s limitations, American Indian activists were instrumental in getting it passed. In response to discussion of renewed uranium mining in the US to support new nuclear reactors, the Navajo nation banned uranium mining and the Lakota nation successfully prevented corporate exploration of potential uranium mines on the Pine Ridge reservation.16 The Western Shoshone actively resisted nuclear testing from the 1980s to 1992 and challenged recent proposals that may portend renewed testing at the NTS. Every May, the Shundahai Network sponsors a Mother’s Day event at the Nevada test site, which culminates in a direct action to assert Western Shoshone land rights. Furthermore, resistance from Western Shoshone people and Utah downwinders forced the cancellation of a non-nuclear sub-critical test (Divine Strake) proposed for the NTS in June 2006. Now, with over 60 years of uranium mining, nuclear weapons production and nuclear power, we face a high-level nuclear waste crisis. Once again, power brokers have looked to exploit American Indian lands, resources and peoples. **In the** twentyyear **process of** researching and **authorizing a federal** high-level **nuclear waste repository site, only sites on [Indigenous]** American Indian **land were seriously considered**. In addition to the Yucca Mountain site, American Indian nations were also targeted for temporary waste storage through the now-defunct Monitored Retrievable Storage (MRS) program.17 And recently, a proposal by Private Fuel Storage (PFS) and the Skull Valley Goshutes to temporarily store nuclear waste at Skull Valley Goshute reservation was defeated by Skull Valley activists working with the State of Utah against the Skull Valley government and PFS.18 The struggle over the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste site is, as Kuletz pointed out, a continuation of struggles against nuclear colonialism: ‘‘Indian protests over the use of Yucca Mountain as a high-level nuclearwaste dump cannot be seen as an anomaly. Rather, they are a part of a persistent pattern of resistance to military occupation and nuclear activity.’’19 Although we do not yet know the health and environmental effects of permanent nuclear waste storage, nuclear colonialism is not just about health and environmental devastation. It also intersects with sovereignty, nuclearism and colonialism, to which I now turn.

#### **Indigenous sovereignty only ever exists in relation to the USFG recognizing it – USFG control is always a reinstatement of colonial sovereignty— The autonomy of Indigenous nations must be the central goal in deconstructing the settler mode of thought.**

Lopez 04**[[9]](#footnote-9)**

The issue of nuclear waste has played a key role in obscuring the definition of Native American sovereignty. **Although sovereignty is a simple concept, contradictory government policies have skewed its definition** and made it a sticky subject for even the politically astute to comprehend. **By turning their nose up at treaties and claiming [Indigenous]** Native American **land as their property for nuclear testing and radioactive waste dumping, the government has blown** gaping **holes into** Native American **sovereignty rights**. Sadly, **the government’s view on sovereignty is that “**.**a**n Indian **Tribe is sovereign to the extent that the United States permits it to be sovereign.”** (United States v. Blackfeet Tribe, 1973). **No [Indigenous]** Native American **nation can be a truly autonomous entity if the United States government can choose when they wish to give them sovereignty.**

#### Thus, we affirm the resolution as an embrace of the politics of impossible – we demand a world in which we kick the US and its nuclear plants off the planet.

#### Demanding a world where we kick the US off the planet and give back the land is a necessary resistance strategy. Prioritization is key.

Churchill 96[[10]](#footnote-10) Bracketed for language

The question which inevitably arises with regard to indigenous land claims, especially in the United States, is whether they are "realistic." The answer, of course, is, "No, they aren't." Further, no form of decolonization has ever been realistic when viewed within the construct of a colonialist paradigm. It wasn't realistic at the time to expect George Washington's rag-tag militia to defeat the British military during the American Revolution. Just ask the British. It wasn't realistic, as the French could tell you, that the Vietnamese should be able to defeat U.S.-backed France in 1954, or that the Algerians would shortly be able to follow in their footsteps. Surely, it wasn't reasonable to predict that Fidel Castro's pitiful handful of guerrillas would overcome Batista's regime in Cuba, another U.S. client, after only a few years in the mountains. And the Sandinistas, to be sure, had no prayer of attaining victory over Somoza 20 years later. Henry Kissinger, among others, knew that for a fact. The point is that in each case, in order to begin their struggles at all, anti-colonial fighters around the world havehad to abandon orthodox realism in favor of what they knew (and their opponents knew) to be right. To paraphrase Daniel Cohn-Bendit, they accepted as their agenda-the goals, objectives, and demands which guided them-**a redefinition of reality in terms deemed quite impossible within the conventional wisdom of their oppressors**. And, in each case, they succeeded in their immediate quest for liberation.202 The fact that all but one (Cuba) of the examples used subsequently turned out to hold colonizing pretensions of its own does not alter the truth of this-or alter the appropriateness of their efforts to decolonize themselves-in the least. It simply means that decolonization has yet to run its course, that much remains to be done. The battles waged by native nations in North America to free themselves, and the lands upon which they depend for ongoing existence as discernible peoples, from the grip of U.S. (and Canadian) internal colonialism are plainly part of this process of liberation. Given that their very survival depends upon their perseverance in the face of all apparent odds, American Indians [Indigenous peoples] have no real alternative but to carry on. They must struggle, and where there is struggle there is always hope. Moreover, the unrealistic or "romantic" dimensions of our aspiration to quite literally dismantle the territorial corpus of the U.S. state begin to erode when one considers that federal domination of [Indigenous] Native North America is utterly contingent upon maintenance of a perceived confluence of interests between prevailing governmental/ corporate elites and common non-Indian citizens. Herein lies the prospect of long-term success. It is entirely possible that the consensus of opinion concerning non-Indian "rights" to exploit the land and resources of indigenous nations can be eroded, and that large numbers of non-Indians will join in the struggle to decolonize Native North America. Few non-Indians wish to identify with or defend the naziesque characteristics of US. history. To the contrary, most seek to deny it in rather vociferous fashion. All things being equal, they are uncomfortable with many of the resulting attributes of federal posture and-in substantial numbers-actively oppose one or more of these, so long as such politics do not intrude into a certain range of closely guarded self-interests. This is where the crunch comes in the realm of Indian rights issues. Most non-[Indigenous people] Indians (of all races and ethnicities, and both genders**)** have been indoctrinated to believe the officially contrived notion that, in the event "the [Indigenous people] Indians get their land back," or even if the extent of present federal domination is relaxed, native [Indigenous] people will do unto their occupiers exactly as has been done to them; mass dispossession and eviction of non-Indians, especially Euroamericans, is expected to ensue. Hence, even those progressives who are most eloquently inclined to condemn U.s. imperialism abroad and/ or the functions of racism and sexism at home tend to deliver a blank stare or profess open "disinterest" when indigenous land rights are mentioned. Instead of attempting to come to grips with this most fundamental of all issues on the continent upon which they reside, the more sophisticated among them seek to divert discussion into "higher priority" or "more important" topics like "issues of class and gender equity" in which "justice" becomes synonymous with a redistribution of power and loot deriving from the occupation of [Indigenous] Native North America even while the occupation continues (presumably permanently) . Sometimes, Indians are even slated to receive "their fair share" in the division of spoils accruing from expropriation of their resources. Always, such things are couched-and typically seen-in terms of some "greater good" than decolonizing the .6 percent of the U.S. population which is indigenous.203 Some marxist and environmentalist groups have taken the argument so far as to deny that Indians possess any rights distinguishable from those of their conquerors.204 AIM leader Russell Means snapped the picture into sharp focus when he observed in 1987 that: All that is needed is an honest, open, and binding forum-such as a new bilateral treaty process--with which to proceed. In fact, numerous native peoples have, for a long time, repeatedly and in a variety of ways, expressed a desire to participate in just such a process. • Nonetheless, it is argued, there will still be at least some non-Indians "trapped" within such restored areas. Actually, they would not be trapped at all The federally imposed genetic criteria of "Indian-ness" discussed elsewhere in this book notwithstanding, indigenous nations have the same rights as any other to define citizenry by allegiance (naturalization) rather than by race. Non-Indians could apply for citizenship, or for some form of landed alien status which would allow them to retain their property until they die. In the event they could not reconcile themselves to living under any jurisdiction other than that of the United States, they would obviously have the right to leave, and they should have the right to compensation from their own government (which got them into the mess in the first place).209 • Finally, and one suspects this is the real crux of things from the government/ corporate perspective, any such restoration of land and attendant sovereign prerogatives to native nations would result in a truly massive loss of "domestic" resources to the United States, thereby impairing the country's economic and military capacities (see "Radioactive Colonialism" essay for details). For everyone who queued up to wave flags and tie on yellow ribbons during the United States' recent imperial adventure in the Persian Gulf, this prospect may induce a certain psychic trauma. But, for progressives at least, it should be precisely the point. When you think about these issues in this way, the great mass of non-Indians in North America really have much to gain, and almost nothing to lost.:, from tilt.: success of native people in struggles to reclaim the land which is rightfully ours. The tangible diminishment of U.S. material power which is integral to our victories in this sphere stands to pave the way for realization of most other agendas-from anti-imperialism to environmentalism, from African-American liberation to feminism, from gay rights to the ending of class privilege pursued by progressives on this continent. Conversely, succeeding with any or even all these other agendas would still represent an inherently oppressive situation if their realization is contingent upon an ongoing occupation of Native North America without the consent of Indian people**.** Any North American revolution which failed to free indigenous territory from non-Indian domination would be simply a continu[e]ation of colonialism in another form. Regardless of the angle from which you view the matter, the liberation of Native North America, liberation of the land first and foremost, is the key to fundamental and positive social changes of many other sorts. One thing, as they say, leads to another. The question has always been, of course, which "thing" is to be first in the sequence. A preliminary formulation for those serious about achieving (rather than merely theorizing and endlessly debating) radical change in the United States might be "First Priority to First Americans." Put another way, this would mean, "U.S. Out of [Indigenous] Indian Country. " Inevitably, the logic leads to what we've all been so desperately seeking: the United States-at least as we've come to know it-out of North America altogether. From there, it can be permanently banished from the planet. In its stead, surely we can join hands to create something new and infinitely better. That's our vision of "impossible realism." Isn't it time we all went to work on attaining it?

#### The 1AC is not a demand for inclusion—it is a questioning of the system to which we are trying to include Indigenous bodies in the first place. Theories that try to make the USFG accessible to oppressed bodies only serves to justify assimilation

Grande 04 Sandy Grande “Red Pedagogy” 2004

Contemporary revolutionary **scholars critique liberal models of democracy** and education, **naming their "politics of inclusion' as an accomplice to** the broader project of **assimilation.** Specifically, they argue that **such models ignore the historic, economic, and material conditions of "difference,"** conspicuously **averting the whitestream gaze away from issues of power.** Critical scholars therefore maintain that **while liberal theorists may invest in** the "theoretical **idealism**" of democracy, **they remain** "**amnesiatic toward the** continued lived **realities of democratically induced oppression**" (Richardson and Villenas 2000, 260).

#### Indigenous land restoration is key to undermine the ability of the state to enforce its codes of Euroamerican centrality which is the root cause of all forms of oppression.

Churchill 2[[11]](#footnote-11)

Not only is it perfectly reasonable to assert that **a restoration of** Indian **[Indigenous] control over** unceded **lands within the United States** **would** do nothing to perpetuate such problems as sexism and classism, but the reconstitution of indigenous societies this would entail stands to free the affected portions of North America from such maladies altogether. Moreover, it can be said that the process should **have a tangible impact in terms of diminishing such oppressions elsewhere.** The principles is this: **sexism, racism, and all the rest arose here as a concomitant to the emergence and consolidation of the Eurocentric** nation-state **form of sociopolitical** and economic **organization. Everything the state does**, everything it can do, **is entirely contingent on its maintaining its internal cohesion**, a cohesion signified above all by its pretended territorial integrity, its ongoing domination of Indian Country. Given this, it seems obvious that **the literal dismemberment of the nation-state inherent to** Indian **[Indigenous] land recovery correspondingly reduces the ability of the state to sustain the imposition of objectionable relations within itself.** It follows that **realization of indigenous land rights serves to undermine or destroy the ability of the status quo to continue imposing a racist, sexist, classist, homophobic, militaristic order** on non-Indians.

#### Opposition must start outside of the state—all of your state good arguments continue to be band-aid alterations that just reinforce the sovereign power of the USFG.

Churchill 3[[12]](#footnote-12)

That's looking for a painless fix again. **Power and leverage in the traditional sense are not going to bring fundamental change** into being. **Each of those entities is a projector of the same kind of violence**, but on a quantitatively lesser scale than the U.S. **However, the nature of their intervention, based upon their perception of self-interest, is convincing the U.S. to [change] in a way that will not visit undue consequences upon them. You'd get cosmetic alterations**-policy adjustments and so forth-a refinement **of the system, thus the continuation of the status quo. It would ultimately create illusions of change and keep people confused. Third world opposition on the other hand understands this dynamic much more clearly. You have to have an eradication of the beast, not a retraining of the beast's performance.**

## Underview

# Underview Add Ons

### A2 Deleuze Underview

#### Government policies force Indigenous identity into static conception in order to prove that they are “Native” enough to access reservations. Failing to constantly prove an “Indian” bloodline or embracing fluid identity destroys any possible Indigenous culture because the government dismisses you as not “Indian” enough. Postmodern conceptions of identity fluidity only serve to re-entrench white assimilation and destroy Indigenous culture.

Grande 04**[[13]](#footnote-13)** **bracketed for language**

While critical theorists contest the hegemonic forces that eventuated this "imposition," they also continue to presume the normalcy of the democratic order. This presumption fails to account for the "difference" of American In- dian tribal identity—specifically, what it means to be sovereign, tribal peo- ples within the geopolitical confines of the United States. Native scholars, thus, remain skeptical of the "new" political project, viewing it as simply the latest in a long line of political endeavors aimed at absorbing American Indi- ans into the prevailing model of the "democratic citizen."In response, indigenous scholars have worked hard to articulate the "dif- ference" of tribal identity, distinguishing it, both legally and culturally, from mainstream conceptions of identity. Such efforts have been, in some ways, shaped by the need for a collective indigenous response to the dehumanizing and racist depictions of Indian-ness put forth by whitestream America. As such, the emergent counterhegemonic discourse generated antiracist and highly idealized constructions of American Indian identity and culture. War- rior (1995) notes the mid-1980s as the height of when idealized images of American Indians flooded the marketplace with writings about the benevolent "Indian worldview" dominating the discourse. Of this era Warrior states, "such a commitment to essentialized indigenous worldviews and conscious- ness became . . . a pervasive and almost requisite feature of American Indian critical writing" (1995, xvii). Though a cadre of indigenous scholars have always expressed resistance to essentialist depictions of American Indian culture and identity (e.g., Chrytos, Deloria, Durham, Forbes, Vizenor, and Warrior), they continue to hold sway. In particular, communities struggling to fetter the impact of colonialist forces—specifically, identity appropriation ("ethnic fraud"), cultural imperi- alism, and corporate commodification— are compelled by essentialist definitions of Indian-ness and the clearly demarcated lines between "us" and "them." The project of defining a contemporary Indian identity is, thus, highly mediated by whitestream forces, particularly the homogenizing effects of global capitalism. This reality exposes the perceived existential crisis of identity as in actuality a crisis of power. Specifically, the power to name, shape, and control the products and conditions of one's life and particularly one's labor. As a result, the "crisis" of American Indian **[Indigenous] identity is** perhaps better ar- ticulated as **an identity paradox**. That is, **at the same time the relentless cadence of colonialist forces necessitates [Indigenous people]** American Indians **to retain** more closed or **"essentialist" constructions of Indian-ness, the challenges of their own "burgeoning multiculturalism" requires the construction of** more open, **fluid**, and "transgressive" **definitions** of Indian-ness. This paradox or the ten- sion between the urgency to border-cross and impulse to border-patrol is one of the central themes of this chapter. More specifically, I aim to reveal how the rancor of identity politics has not only deeply compromised the power of American Indians to mediate the forces of colonialism and global capitalism but also how dominant modes of educational theory have failed to construct models of identity that effectively interrogate and disrupt the project of col- onization.The discussion begins with an examination of the legal and political forces that have shaped the historical formation of American Indian identity. Then, a contemporary model of "the difference of tribal identity" is articulated as a by-product of these historical forces. Next, the dominant modes of identity theory—left-essentialism and postmodernism—are examined in terms of their intersection with current formations of American Indian identity. This analysis reveals how **whitestream theories of identity have not only failed to interrogate and disrupt the project of colonization but have also provided the theoretical basis and intellectual space for its continuance**. More specifically, the colonialist forces of corporate commodification, identity appropriation, and cultural imperialism are discussed as the consequences of a geographic and political terrain that aims to absorb indigenous peoples. Finally, concepts that emerge from critical theories of identity — specifi- cally the construct of *mestizaje* and other models of hybridity —are exam- ined as potential tools for developing a counterdiscourse of American Indian subjectivity. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the need for an in- digenous theory of identity—one historically grounded in indigenous strug- gles for self-determination, politically centered in issues of sovereignty, and spiritually guided by the religious traditions of American Indian peoples. The aim is to develop an emancipatory theory —a new Red pedagogy—that acts as a true counterdiscourse, counterpraxis, counterensoulment2of in- digenous identity. THE HISTORICAL FORMATION OF AMERICAN INDIAN IDENTITY: TOWARD A MODEL OF TRIBAL IDENTITY The "discovery" of natives in the so-called New World offered one of the greatest challenges to Europeans' accepted notions of self, personhood, and culture. Hayden White (1976, 133) notes that their encounter with a race of "wild men" created a crisis of category for the general notion of "humanity" developed in Western philosophy, igniting a debate between two opposing views of Indians: On the one hand, natives were conceived to be continuous with the humanity on which Europeans prided themselves; and it was this mode of relationship that underlay the policy of proselytization and conversion. On the other hand, the natives could be conceived as simply existing contiguously to Europeans, as representing either an inferior breed of humanity or a superior breed, but in any case being essentially different from the European breed; and it was this mode of relationship that underlay the policies of war and extermination which the Europeans followed throughout the seventeenth and most of the eighteenth century. At stake for the colonizers was not only the prospect of acquiring religious converts but also of defining the terms of political engagement— were the na- tives "the same" and therefore deserving of equal rights or were they inferior deserving of no rights at all? Such questions were critical for a young de- mocracy working to build its notion of democratic citizenship on the "truths" of individualism and private property. The bloody encounter between these operational truths and those of the In- dian nations came to a head in 1887 with the passage of the General Allotment Act. As discussed in chapter 2, Senator Henry Dawes spearheaded a campaign to rid the nation of tribalism through the virtues of private property, allotting land parcels to Indian heads of family. **Before allotments could be dispensed**, however, **the government had to determine which Indians were eligible, ignite[ed]ing the official search for a federal definition of Indian-ness. The task of defining "Indian-ness" was assigned to the Dawes commission, a delegation of white men who** facilely **embraced the** prevailing racial purity model, expressing **Indian-ness in terms of blood-quantum**. Satisfied with their quantifiable definition of Indian-ness, Dawes commis- sioners dispersed into the field, interviewing thousands of Indians about their "origins." Much to their dismay, federal officials found that "after forced re- locations, intermarriages, absconded parents, informal adoptions, and civil wars" many Indians had only fuzzy ideas of their origins and little knowledge of their blood-quantum (Malcomson 2000, 16). **Since there was no "scientific" means of determining precise bloodlines, commission members** often **ascribed blood status based on** their own **racist notions of what it meant to be Indian**—designating full-blood status to "poorly assimilated" Indians and mixed-blood status to those who most resembled whites. As a result, a sig- nificant number of Indians refused to comply with the process of racial cate- gorization (Malcomson 2000). Unfazed, the Dawes Commission published the first comprehensive tribal rolls neatly listing names in one column and blood quanta in another; designating F for "full-blood" and 1/2,1/4, or 1/8 for "mixed bloods." Land parcels were dispensed according to the lists and followed their same racist logic. That is, "full-blooded" Indians (considered legally incompetent), received relatively small parcels of land deeded with trust patents over which the government retained complete control for a minimum of twenty-five years. "Mixed-blood" Indians, on the other hand, were deeded larger and bet- ter tracts of land, with "patents in fee simple" (complete control), but were also forced to accept U.S. citizenship and relinquish tribal status (Churchill and Morris 1992; Stiffarm and Lane 1992). In perhaps the most controversial turn, Indians who failed to meet the established criteria were effectively "de- tribalized," deposed of their American Indian identity and displaced from their homelands, discarded into the nebula of the American "otherness."3 Its myriad indiscretions arguably make Dawes the single most destructive U.S. policy. All told, the act empowered the U.S. government to: (1) legally preempt the sovereign right of Indians to define themselves; (2) implement the specious notion of blood-quantum as the legal criteria for defining Indi- ans;4(3) institutionalize divisions between "full-bloods" and "mixed- bloods";5(4) "detribalize" a sizable segment of the Indian population;6and (5) legally appropriate vast tracts of Indian land. Indeed, so "successful" was this aspect of the "democratic experiment" that the federal government de- cided to retain—or rather, further exploit—the notion of blood-quantum and federal recognition as the means for dispensing other resources and services such as health care and educational funding. An Operational Definition of Indian-ness While five centuries of imperialist strategies may have decimated the tradi- tional societies of preinvasion times, modern American Indian communities still resemble traditional societies enough so that, "given a choice between In- dian society and non-Indian society, most Indians feel comfortable with their owninstitutions, lands and traditions" (Deloria and Lytle 1983, xii). Despite the persistent divide between "Indian" and "non-Indian" societies, however, defining tribal America has remained curiously difficult? To tease out, name, and assign primacy to certain aspects of Indian-ness as "the definition" would not only grossly oversimplify the complexity of American Indian subjectivity (forcing what is fundamentally traditional, spatial, and interconnected into the modern, temporal, and epistemic frames of Western theory), but also reenact the objectification of Indians set in motion by the Dawes commission over a century ago. Accordingly, the following rubric merely calls attention to the "difference" of tribal identity as conceived through some of the legal indica- tors of what it means to be American Indian in U.S. society. 8It is not meant to represent some mythic view of a unified indigenous culture or objectified view of American Indian identity. The Difference of Tribal Identity *• Sovereignty vs. Democracy:* American Indians have been engaged in a centuries-long struggle to have what is legally theirs recognized (i.e., land, sovereignty, treaty rights). As such, indigenous peoples have not, like other marginalized groups, been fighting for inclusion in the demo- cratic imaginary, but rather for the right to remain distinct, sovereign, and tribal peoples. *• Treaty Rights:* These rights articulate the unique status of Indian tribes as "domestic dependent nations." A dizzying array of tribal, federal, and state laws, policies, and treaties creates a political maze that keeps the le- gal status of most tribes in a constant state of flux. Treaties are negoti- ated and renegotiated in a process that typically reduces tribal rights and erodes traditional structures (Deloria and Lytle 1984; Fixcio 1998). *• Dual Citizenship:* The Indian Citizenship Act of 1924 extends the rights of full citizenship to American Indians born within the territorial United States insofar as such status does not infringe upon the rights to tribal and other property. It is a dual citizenship wherein American Indians do not lose civil rights because of their status as tribal members and individual tribal members are not denied tribal rights because of their American cit- izenship (Deloria and Lytle 1984).9 *• Federal Recognition:* **Federal law mandates that [Indigenous people]** American Indians **prove that they have continued to exist over time as stable**, prima facie **entities to retain** federal recognition as tribes. **Acknowledgment of tribal existence** by the Department of the Interior is critical, as it **is a prerequisite to the protection, services, and benefits** made available by the federal government to Indian tribes by virtue of their status as tribes. Therefore, **a tribe's existence is contingent upon its ability to prove its existence over time**, to provide evidence of shared cultural patterns, and to prove "persistence of **a named, collective Indian identity**" (Bureau of **Indian** Affairs, USD, 83, 7). *Economic Dependency:* American Indians continue to exist as nations within a nation wherein the relationship between the U.S. government and Indian tribes is not the fictive "government to government" relation- ship described in U.S. documents, but, rather, one that positions tribes as fundamentally dependent on the federal government.10 *• Reservations:* Almost two-thirds of American Indians continue to either live on or remain significantly tied to their reservations and, as such, re- main predominantly "tribally oriented" as opposed to generically Indian (Joe and Miller 1997). The above indicators position American Indians in a wholly unique and paradoxical relationship to the United States. They also illuminate the inher- ent contradictions of modern American Indian existence: **the paradox of having to prove "authenticity" to gain legitimacy** as a "recognized" tribe, **while simultaneously having to negotiate a postmodern world in which all claims to authenticity are dismissed as essentialist** if not racist). This reality not only conscripts American Indians to a gravely dangerous and precarious space but also points to the gross insufficiency of models that treat American Indians as simply another ethnic minority group. Specifically, **the identity paradox** of American Indians deeply **problema- tizes the postmodern insistence that we move beyond concretized categories and disrupt the "myth" of prima facie** indicators of **identity**. For American Indians, **such notions only reflect whitestream reality**. For instance, it currently remains a fundamental truth of Indian reality —no matter how you define it—that the titles to Indian land remain in the hands of the U. S. government. Moreover, **the U.S. government**—not tribes—**retains the right to confer "federal recognition" and** therefore the power to enable **self- determination**. Indeed, the criteria required for federal recognition are con- structed to protect the rights and interests of the government and not those of Indian tribes. According to the *Indian Definition Study* (1980), the inner contradictions of the current criteria create the following impossible para- dox for tribes: 1. An American Indian is a member of any federally recognized tribe. To be federally recognized, an Indian tribe must be comprised of American Indians. 2. To gain federal recognition, an Indian tribe must have a land base. To secure a land base, an Indian tribe must be federally recognized." So, five hundred years after the European invasion, "recognized" and "un- recognized" American Indian **[Indigenous] communities repeatedly find** themselves **en- gage**d **in absurd efforts to prove** (in whitestream courts) **their existence over time as stable and distinct groups** of people. Thus, **contrary to postmodern rhetoric, there are in fact, stable markers and prima facie indicators of what it means to be Indian in American society**. Within this context, **indigenous scholars cannot afford to perceive essentialism as a mere theoretical construct and may**, in fact, **be justified in their understanding of it a[i]s the last line of defense against capitalistic encroachment and last available means for retaining cultural** integrity **and tribal sovereignty**. The question therefore remains whether contemporary theories of identity are able to provide any valuable insights to the paradox of American Indian iden- tity formation.

### A2 Extinction Underview

#### Emphasis on an impending apocalypse as the major danger to human life is a direct effacement of the everyday violence of institutionalized racism – the fiction of uniqueness for their extinction impact can only be establish through a genocidal forgetting of the historical world-ending violence of white supremacy

Omolade 89**[[14]](#footnote-14)**

Recent efforts by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan to limit nuclear testing, stockpiling, and weaponry, while still protecting their own arsenals and selling arms to countries and factions around the world, vividly demonstrate how "peace" can become an abstract concept within a culture of war. Many peace activists are similarly blind to the constant wars and threats of war being waged against people of color and the planet by those who march for "peace" and by those they march against. These pacifists, like Gorbachev and Reagan, frequently want people of color to fear what they fear and define peace as they define it. They are unmindful that our lands and peoples have already been and are being destroyed as part of the "final solution" of the "color line."It is difficult to persuade the remnants of [Indigenous] Native American tribes**,** the starving of African deserts, and the victims of the Cambodian "killing fields" that nuclear war is the major danger to human life on the planet and that only a nuclear "winter" embodies fear and futurelessness for humanity. The peace movement suffersgreatlyfrom its lack of a historical and holistic perspective, practice, and vision that include the voices and experiences of people of color;the movement's goals and messages have therefore been easily coopted and expropriated by world leaders who share the same culture of racial dominance and arrogance. The peace movement's racist blinders have divorced peace from freedom, from feminism, from education reform, from legal rights, from human rights, from international alliances and friendships, from national liberation, from the particular (for example, black female, Native American male) and the general(human being). Nevertheless, social movements such as the civil rights-black power movement in the United States have always demanded peace with justice, with liberation, and with social and economic reconstruction and cultural freedom at home and abroad. The integration of our past and our present holocausts and our struggle to define our own lives and have our basic needs metare at the core of the inseparable struggles for world peace and social betterment. The Achilles heel of the organized peace movement in this country has always been its whiteness. In this multi-racial and racist society, no allwhite movement can have the strength to bring about basic changes. It is axiomatic that basic changes do not occur in any society unless the people who are oppressed move to make them occur. In our society it is people of color who are the most oppressed. Indeed our entire history teaches us that when people of color have organized and struggled-most especially, because of their particular history, Black people-have moved in a more humane direction as a society, toward a better life for all people.1 Western man's whiteness, imagination, enlightened science, and movements toward peace have developed from a culture and history mobilized against women of color.The political advancements of white men have grown directly from the devastation and holocaust of people of color and our lands. This technological and material progress has been in direct proportion to the undevelopment of women of color. Yet the dayto- day survival, political struggles, and rising up of women of color, especially black women in the United States, reveal both complex resistance to holocaust and undevelopment and often conflicted responses to the military and war. The Holocausts Women of color are survivors of and remain casualties of holocausts, and we are direct victims of war-that is, of open armed conflict between countries or between factions within the same country. But women of color were not soldiers**,** nor did we trade animal pelts or slaves to the white man for guns**,** nor did we sell or lease our lands to the white man for wealth. Most men and women of color resisted and fought back, were slaughtered, enslaved, and force marched into plantation labor camps to serve the white masters of war and to build their empires and war machines. People of color were and are victims of holocausts-that is, of great and widespread destruction, usually by fire. The world as we knew and created it was destroyed in a continual scorched earth policy of the white man. The experience of Jews and other Europeans under the Nazis can teach us the value of understanding the totality of destructive intent, the extensiveness of torture, and the demonical apparatus of war aimed at the human spirit. A Jewish father pushed his daughter from the lines of certain death at Auschwitz and said, "You will be a remembrance-You tell the story. You survive." She lived. He died. Many have criticized the Jews for forcing non-Jews to remember the 6 million Jews who died under the Nazis and for etching the names Auschwitz and Buchenwald, Terezin and Warsaw in our minds. Yet as women of color, we, too, are "remembrances" of all the holocausts against the people of the world. We must remember the names of concentration camps such as Jesus, Justice, Brotherhood, and Integrity,ships that carried millions of African men, women, and children chained and brutalized across the ocean to the "New World." We must remember the Arawaks, the Taino, the Chickasaw, the Choctaw, the Narragansett, the Montauk, the Delaware**,** and the other Native American names of thousands of U.S. towns that stand for tribes of people who are no more**.** We must remember the holocausts visited against the Hawaiians**,** the aboriginal peoples of Australia, the Pacific Island peoples, and the women and children of Hiroshima and Nagasaki**.** We must remember the slaughter of men and women at Sharpeville, the children of Soweto, and the men of Attica**.** We must never, ever, forget the children disfigured, the men maimed, and the women broken in our holocausts**-**we must remember the names, the numbers, the faces, and the stories and teach them to our children and our children's children so the world can never forget our suffering and our courage. Whereas the particularity of the Jewish holocaust under the Nazis is over, our holocausts continue. We are the madres locos (crazy mothers) in the Argentinian square silently demanding news of our missing kin from the fascists who rule. We are the children of El Salvador who see our mothers and fathers shot in front of our eyes. We are the Palestinian and Lebanese women and children overrun by Israeli, Lebanese, and U.S. soldiers. We are the women and children of the bantustans and refugee camps and the prisoners of Robbin Island. We are the starving in the Sahel, the poor in Brazil, the sterilized in Puerto Rico. We are the brothers and sisters of Grenada who carry the seeds of the New Jewel Movement in our hearts, not daring to speak of it with our lipsyet. Our holocaust is South Africa ruled by men who loved Adolf Hitler, who have developed the Nazi techniques of terror to more sophisticated levels. Passes replace the Nazi badges and stars. Skin color is the ultimate badge of persecution. Forced removals of women, children, and the elderly-the "useless appendages of South Africa"-into barren, arid bantustans without resources for survival have replaced the need for concentration camps. Black sex-segregated barracks and cells attached to work sites achieve two objectives: The work camps destroy black family and community life, a presumed source of resistance, and attempt to create human automatons whose purpose is to serve the South African state's drive toward wealth and hegemony. Like other fascist regimes, South Africa disallows any democratic rights to black people; they are denied the right to vote, to dissent, to peaceful assembly, to free speech, and to political representation. The regime has all the typical Nazi-like political apparatus: house arrests of dissenters such as Winnie Mandela; prison murder of protestors such as Stephen Biko; penal colonies such as Robbin Island. Black people, especially children, are routinely arrested without cause, detained without limits, and confronted with the economic and social disparities of a nation built around racial separation. Legally and economically, South African apartheid is structural and institutionalized racial war. The Organization of African Unity's regional intergovernmental meeting in 1984 in Tanzania was called to review and appraise the achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women. The meeting considered South Africa's racist apartheid regime a peace issue. The "regime is an affront to the dignity of all Africans on the continent and a stark reminder of the absence of equality and peace, representing the worst form of institutionalized oppression and strife." Pacifists such as Martin Luther King, Jr. and Mahatma Gandhi who have used nonviolent resistance charged that those who used violence to obtain justice were just as evil as their oppressors. Yet all successful revolutionary movements have used organized violence. This is especially true of national liberation movements that have obtained state power and reorganized the institutions of their nations for the benefit of the people. If men and women in South Africa do not use organized violence, they could remain in the permanent violent state of the slave. Could it be that pacifism and nonviolence cannot become a way of life for the oppressed? Are they only tactics with specific and limited use for protecting people from further violence? For most people in the developing communities and the developing world consistent nonviolence is a luxury; it presumes that those who have and use nonviolent weapons will refrain from using them long enough for nonviolent resisters to win political battles. To survive, peoples in developing countries must use a varied repertoire of issues, tactics, and approaches. Sometimes arms are needed to defeat apartheid and defend freedom in South Africa; sometimes nonviolent demonstrations for justice are the appropriate strategy for protesting the shooting of black teenagers by a white man, such as happened in New York City. Peace is not merely an absence of 'conflict that enables white middleclass comfort**,** nor is it simply resistance to nuclear war and war machinery**.** The litany of "you will be blown up, too"directed by a white man to a black woman obscures the permanency and institutionalization of war, the violence and holocaust that people of color face daily. Unfortunately, the holocaust does not only refer to the mass murder of Jews, Christians, and atheists during the Nazi regime; it also refers to the permanent institutionalization of war that is part of every fascist and racist regime. The holocaust lives. It is a threat to world peace as pervasive and thorough as nuclear war.

## Theory Underview

# 1AR Extensions

**Extend the Role of the Ballot is to affirm the best method to deconstruct settler colonialism – Grande 04 says that pedagogical spaces are key places to develop a critical consciousness against colonialism. You don’t access the role of the ballot – you don’t provide a counter method to deconstruct settler colonialism, you just say that our method should have incorporated something which is not sufficient to access the ballot.**

**Extend the advocacy of affirming the resolution as an impossible demand – we demand a world in which we kick the US and the nuclear power plants off the planet. Several Net Benefits**

1. **Empowerment – Impossible demands are key to empower people to create tangible change because it defines the end goal – ie a world without colonialism and doesn’t let people settle into the pragmatic frames of settler colonialism. Churchill 96 says that every successful revolt against colonialism started with what seemed like an impossible demand – the Vietnamese first needed to demand the impossible, ie that they could beat the US army through guerilla warfare, before they took up arms and did just that.**
2. **Ruptures colonialism – Settler colonialism frames what is pragmatic or not pragmatic to control dissent and resistance. Demanding what colonialism deems as impossible is key to rupture these frames and pose the powerful question of why does the US exist?**

# Frontlines

# A2 Theory

## Theory Overview

**Extend the Role of the Ballot is to affirm the best method to deconstruct settler colonialism – Grande 04 says that pedagogical spaces are key places to develop a critical consciousness against colonialism and thus we need to reject colonialist practices – independent reason to drop you for reading theory, reproduces colonialist norms in debate. AND, several implications on theory –**

**1. ROB comes before theory – (a) it determines what we should read in debate which constrains things like theory and (b) controls the strongest internal link to inclusion – theory forces debate into abstract rules to escape hard conversations which creates an exclusionary debate space where only wealthy theory debaters can participate, and accessibility is a multiplier, your impacts don’t matter if they only apply to a privileged elite. And *(c) it determines what it means to be the better debater which means it contextualizes what fairness is.***

**2. Even if K doesn’t come first this means critical education outweighs fairness – (a) Duration – it’s the only portable skill, while fairness is only valuable in this specific round, the critical thinking skills teach us to be better people which is the end goal of debate and (b) It contextualizes what fairness is – fairness is not a neutral equal playing field but is influenced by things like settler colonialism in indigenous spaces (c) Debate is a unique place to develop a critical consciousness– if we only cared about fairness we would go flip coins all day but we debate because it is a unique place where we can learn about critical literature. *Also – no new 2N weighing on these questions – they had the opportunity to weigh in the 1n but chose to sandbag it – this destroys clash because the 2A isn’t long enough to engage in your arguments and makes the round irresolvable.***

**3. ROB also justifies reasonability – prefer reasonability with a brightline of link and impact turn ground [*and being predictable/disclosed*] because competing interps causes a race to the top where there is always a better interp and that’s the worst harm under the role of the ballot because every conversation about colonialism will be drown out by theory. Brightline means you have sufficient ability to engage – the wiki determines prep not topic lit.**

Extend Tuck and -Fernandez 13 – **Debate perpetuates white supremacy by absorbing Indigenous resistance to settler colonialism through practices of limiting the resolution to the correct or most predictable understanding. Turns limits and grammar, also uniquely justifies an RVI on T – forces the neg to think twice before they disengage from nexus of the debate** [ie whether the US should exist]

Extend **Lopez** – indigenous sovereignty is a core question of topical literature – everyone talks about nuclear power but no one talks about indigenous – turns topical lit

*Extend Deglato – Fairness is not neutral but is a tool of dominant powers to justify their interpretation – it is the equivalent of capitalism saying non intervention is equality – you ignore how one side started off a whole lot more stacked against. Reason to drop you – you create an exclusionary debate space*

#### Embracing alternative forms of debate is crucial to combat oppression within our debate space. In round practices of debaters creating multiple abstract layers to escape hard conversations perpetuate an exclusionary debate space.

Smith 13**[[15]](#footnote-15)**

It will be uncomfortable, it will be hard, and it will require continued effort but the necessary step in fixing this problem, like all problems, is the community as a whole admitting that such a problem with many “socially acceptable” choices exists in the first place. Like all systems of social control, the reality of **racism in debate is constituted by** the singular **choices that** institutions, **coaches, and students make on a weekly basis.** I have watched countless rounds where **competitors** attempt to win by **rush**ing **to abstractions to distance the conversation from** the **material reality** that black debaters are forced to deal with every day. One of the students I coached, who has since graduated after leaving debate, had an adult judge write out a ballot that concluded by “hypothetically” defending my student being lynched at the tournament. Another debate concluded with a young man defending that we can kill animals humanely, “just like we did that guy Troy Davis”. **Community norms** would **have** **competitors do intellectual gymnastics or make up rules** to accuse black debaters of breaking **to escape hard conversations** but as someone who understands that experience, **the only constructive strategy is to** **acknowledge the reality of the oppressed,** **engage the discussion** from the perspective of authors who are black and brown, and then find strategies to deal with the issues at hand. It hurts to see competitive seasons come and go and have high school students and judges spew the same hateful things you expect to hear at a Klan rally**.** A student should not, when presenting an advocacy that aligns them with the oppressed, have to justify why oppression is bad. **Debate is not just a game, but a learning environment with liberatory** **potential** . Even if the form debate gives to a conversation is not the same you would use to discuss race in general conversation with Bayard Rustin or Fannie Lou Hamer, that is not a reason we have to strip that conversation of its connection to a reality that black students cannot escape.

## A2 Countries is Plural

Counter interpretation: the aff may defend the United States or a combination of countries

I meet

Net benefit is K education – their interpretation takes focus away from individual governments committing nuclear colonialism, ie they prevent affs about how the US uniquely marginalizes Indigenous communities and they force us to talk in abstract which prevents material change – talking about the US is specifically key because it’s most applicable to our daily lives and it is key to learn about the tactics of our government.

K education outweighs

1. it’s the most portable and long lasting skill – limits/grammar/fairness only last in this round while critical thinking skills last for the rest of our lives
2. Debate is a unique place to learn about critical education – if we only cared about fairness we would go flip coins all day but we debate because it is a unique place where we can learn about critical literature

## A2 Nebel T

Counter interpretation: the aff may defend the United states or countries in general

I meet

Net benefit is K education – their interpretation takes focus away from individual governments committing nuclear colonialism, ie they prevent affs about how the US uniquely marginalizes Indigenous communities and they force us to talk in abstract which prevents material change – talking about the US is specifically key because it’s most applicable to our daily lives and it is key to learn about the tactics of our government.

K education outweighs

1. it’s the most portable and long lasting skill – limits/grammar/fairness only last in this round while critical thinking skills last for the rest of our lives
2. Debate is a unique place to learn about critical education – if we only cared about fairness we would go flip coins all day but we debate because it is a unique place where we can learn about critical literature

### A2 Semantics

Semantics aren’t fixed and absolute—rather, they are and should be shaped by communal norms:

1. Framers of the res are a lot less deliberate and knowledgeable we assume—instead, as debaters, we should take it into our hands to frame Aff limits, since we do way more research and are the ones actually debating. [Saying they *do* write the res is the is-ought fallacy, but also debaters vote for the topic, which means in the status quo they already have some jurisdiction on the issue.]
2. Turn – Tuck and Fernandez specifically criticizes overly legalistic concerns at the expensive of the ability to challenge settler colonialism – settler colonialism defines words to control dissent which means your interp prevents challenging white supremacy which is the worst harm

**A2 Grammar is Basis of Pre Round Prep**

1. No, the wiki is the *actual* basis for research, not the res—when we read lit we’re always reading for things that are applicable to certain positions and we derive our search terms from other people’s cases.

**A2 Jurisdiction**

1. You haven’t shown that jurisdiction is a strict question of semantics. The reasonability brightline and all the reasons why semantics don’t matter deny the notion that the judge must vote for a strictly semantically topical Aff.

[*Semantics Kritik]* T on the basis of semantics endorses a methodology of linguistic “correctness” that creates a violent dichotomy between competent and inferior English speakers.

#### Niemi[[16]](#footnote-16)

Though I believe Mr. Nebel to be fundamentally wrong on the debate theoretical level, I have a more serious objection. I will make this claim in the strongest terms I possibly can. Correctness is racism. Correctness is “you must be either a boy or a girl or you are wrong.” Correctness is “the ideal functioning body versus all others.” Correctness is one kind of person having access to The Truth and others lacking it. Correctness is “sit down and shut up.” Correctness is “your kind aren’t welcome here.” Any debater who runs so called “Nebel T” and any judge who votes for this argument must acknowledge that they are situationally and strategically embracing [It is] a perspective from which there is an implicit or explicit metric of what it means to be a competent english speaker. What is the logical conclusion [is] of speaking competent English? The notion that “mongrel” forms of english are inferior, diminished, unpersuasive, and should not have access to the ballot. Quite possibly the notion that those who can’t live up to these standards should not be involved in debate. After all, their dialects are not what resolutions are written in – it is people like Mr. Nebel whose dialect prescribes correct resolutional meaning. You may say that “competent speakers” was a rhetorical flourish, I am nitpicking, and that Mr. Nebel should certainly be allowed to take back his offensive speech. I will say this: the competent english speaker, aka the correct type of thinking and being, is the fundamental goal and top-level value that Mr. Nebel appeals to throughout his articles. If this is “not what he meant” then he did not mean that debaters should pay any attention to nor follow his logic. Either he defends correctness or he concedes the irrelevance and negative impacts to fairness and education of his position. Nebel may appeal to pragmatics as a way out of the appeal to correctness, but in fact, his pragmatic claims are a pragmatic justification for correctness. This concedes pragmatics first anyway, and that so to speak, is a flow I can win on. It is my opinion that there is no in or out of round benefit that correctness could provide sufficient to outweigh the toxicity of its implementation and rhetorical methodology. In one sense we should be thankful that Mr. Nebel has let the cat out of the bag: T arguments from the perspective of correctness have always been the vehicle for racism and exclusion of all sorts. I cannot imagine a construction of competent english or correct grammar that is not racialized, gendered, and further influenced by its origins. To me it is impossible to endorse the claim to correctness without conceding that one is invested in a justification of domination (of course they won’t call it that) stretching across axes of class, race, gender, flesh, and cultural origin. The one place where Mr. Nebel speaks to this question, he dismisses it by claiming that specific examples are insufficient to deal with the bare plurality of his arguments. Mr. Nebel is kind to differentiate for us that there is “generic” or “competent” english, and that is its own dialect, where as these other dialects or ways of speaking are simply different uncomparable dialects. This truly tests my credulity. Are higher pitched so-called “feminine” voices less competent speakers of english? Are those who have read words in books but never heard them pronounced due to lack of high-grade prep school educations less competent? What about those who speak in accents, vernaculars, or dialects of english? For that matter, what about overlaps and points of connection between those ways of speaking and “generic english?” We can easily assume what Mr. Nebel thinks about speech impediments, or those who are unfamiliar with formal usage of grammar. Perhaps even run on sentences disqualify one from being a competent english speaker? Or an overabundance of rhetorical questions? Does anyone have memorized the full and formal set of rules for speaking competent or proper english? Does anyone actually trust that all those rules aren’t implicitly ideological? It is hard to believe that Mr. Nebel is blind to the values he endorses. Perhaps we should accurately hold him to them.

Thus you should reject the aff to create a more inclusive debate space - T arguments from the perspective of a correct interpretation of grammar is a way to impose exclusionary linguistic norms. Only rejecting them will sever the link between correctness and better debating. Whether the judge can evaluate who is doing the better debating presumes equal ability to debate and gain access to the ballot. Some arguments make the round exclusionary—thus the prima facie role of the ballot is to maintain the safety of the debate space—it’s a voting issue since it’s a prerequisite to debate itself—the judge cannot evaluate who is winning on another layer of the flow if you exclude others voices.

### A2 Limits

1. No impact – we only add one more aff which means we solve limits
2. Turn – limits are bad because it allows settler colonialism to control which conversations are allowered or not allowed – especially true in this case because Lopez says that the USFG controls dissent about nuclear colonialism – err on the side of underlimiting
3. No impact – all of your generics apply which means no loss of clash – you can still read your warming DA, all the reasons nuclear power is good respond to the aff
4. Debates under the interpretation are bad – even if we’d clash we’d clash on the bad things

### A2 You Can Read On Neg

This assumes that the switch side model of debate is good which you didn’t justify

1. No guarantee that the negative will read GBTL which means we won’t get that education
2. Aff shouldn’t be forced to defend morally reprehensible things

## A2 ROB Spec

Counter interpretation is the converse of the interpretation with the plank “if they are willing to clarify in CX”

I meet

Net benefits:  
1. Critical Education – Your interpretation prevents wide K debates where 1NCs are forced to give reasons why their offense matters under the ROTB and forces substantive time tradeoffs where affs have to waste time listing every possible way 1NC offense could matter under the ROTB. Critical Education is key to education because it teaches us how to question our assumptions and create real world change.

2. Net benefits to checking in cx

1. Time – Forcing me to spec in the 1AC trades off with the substantive engagement of the debate round. Substantive debate is key to topic education and to deconstruct colonialism because reading and clashing on issues of the methodology of the aff is the only way we learn about the issues of the topic.
2. Strat Skew – It is impossible for me to predict every piece of offense that would engage the ROTB and forcing the aff to explain every conceivable turn to the ROB is the equivalent of forcing someone who reads a Kant NC to explain to the 1AR every argument that would turn Kant *IN THE NC ITSELF*.

Overview to their standards –

1. Education and engagement don’t impact to the role of the ballot – they needed to do work on to how it actually deconstructs settler colonialism which they didn’t do
2. No impact – most affs don’t even read a role of the ballot and the round is adjudicated, util affs don’t specify whether timeframe or magnitude come first and all is good
3. Turn – Never good enough – if I had specified these planks you would have read this interp with different planks which means you can never meet the role of the ballot because itll always be drown out with theory
4. Counter role of the ballot solves – you can read a counter role of the ballot which solves all your standards – also net beneficial (a) role of the ballot debates are good to think critically about debate and (b) turns strat skew – it gives you an extra out which makes your 2NR easier
5. Turn – you kill engagement because debaters will abuse the interp and make their ROB as narrow as possible to exclude any possible engagement of the opponent. The CI is net better for engagement because it forces debaters to prove why their offense matters under the ROB

### A2 Engagement

1. K education outweighs engagement because it is key to have anything to engage on in the first place - it is key to questioning whether the substance that we are engaging in is good in the first place.
2. Engagement inevitable – every debate involves engaging in specific arguments and responding to them or else it wouldn’t be a debate, which means the question is what we are clashing on.

### A2 Resolvability

1. Inevitable – every round gets resolved means there is no impact
2. No resolvability deficit – we just resolve the debate in the 2NR as to whether your offense links or not.

## A2 Framework

Extend Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernandez 13 – Debate perpetuates white supremacy by absorbing Indigenous resistance to settler colonialism through practices of limiting the resolution to the correct or most predictable understanding. Turns limits

Our model of debate is competing methods for liberation within topic area – to clarify, affs are okay as long as they end in a country no longer having nuclear power. We agree policy debate might be good for those who can make use of those skills but that there should also be a space for individuals whose needs are to performatively challenge oppressive structures in their everyday lives

1. Solves limits because it is within the topic area
2. We perm topicality – it isn’t a question of policy making being good but whether every single round needs to be policy making. We will win that talking about things that aren’t policies is good especially because you have 5 other rounds to talk about policies if you want to.

#### Praxis based in the performance of material bodies is a necessary survival strategy and is key to creating change.

**Johnson 05[[17]](#footnote-17)**

Queer studies has rightfully problematized identity politics by elaborating on the processes by which agents and subjects come into being; however, there is a critical gap in queer studies between theory and practice, performance and performativity. Quare studies can narrow that gap to the extent that it pursues **an epistemology rooted in the body**. As a ‘‘theory in the flesh’’ quare necessarily engenders a kind of identity politics, one that acknowledges difference within and between particular groups. Thus, identity politics does not necessarily mean the reduction of multiple identities into a monolithic identity or narrow cultural nationalism. Rather, quare studies moves beyond simply theorizing subjectivity and agency as discursively mediated to theorizing how that mediation may propel material bodies into action. As Shane Phelan reminds us, the maintenance of a progressive identity politics asks ‘‘not whether we share a given position but whether we share a commitment to improve it, and whether we can committo the pain of embarrassment and confrontation as we disagree’’ (156). Quare studies would reinstate the subject andthe identity around which the subject circulates that queer theory so easily dismisses. By refocusing our attention on the racialized bodies, experiences, and knowledges of transgendered people, lesbians, gays, and bisexuals of color, quare studies **grounds the discursive process of** mediated identification and **subjectivity in a political praxis that speaks to the material existence of ‘‘colored’’ bodies**. While strategically galvanized around identity, quare studies should be committed to interrogating identity claims that exclude rather than include. I am thinking here of black nationalist claims of ‘‘black authenticity’’ that exclude, categorically, homosexual identities. Blind allegiance to ‘‘isms’’ of any kind is one of the fears of queer theorists who critique identity politics. Cognizant of that risk, quare studiesmust not deploy a totalizing and homogeneous formulation of identity. Rather, itmustfoster contingent, fragile coalitions as it struggles against common oppressive forms. A number of queer theorists have proposed potential strategies (albeit limited ones) that may be deployed in the service of dismantling oppressive systems. Most significantly, Judith Butler’s formulation of performativity has had an important impact not only on gender and sexuality studies, but on queer studies as well. While I am swayed by Butler’s formulation of gender performativity, I am disturbed by her theory’s failure to articulate a meatier politics of resistance. For example, what are the implications of dismantling subjectivity and social will to ground zero within oppressive regimes? Does **an emphasis on the discursive constitution** of subjects **propel us** beyond a state of quietism **to address** the very real **injustices** in the world? **The body**, I believe, **has to be theorized in ways that** not only **describe** the ways in which it is brought into being, but **what it *does***once it *is* constituted **and the relationship between** it and the **other bodies** around it. In other words, I desire a rejoinder to performativity that allows a space for subjectivity, foragency (however momentary and discursively fraught), and, ultimately, for change. Therefore, to complement notions of performativity, quare studies also deploys theories of performance. Performance theory not only highlights the discursive effects of acts, it also points to how these acts are historically situated. Butler herself acknowledges that the conflation of ‘‘performativity to performance would be a mistake’’ (*Bodies* 234). Indeed, the focus on performativity alone may problematically reduce performativity and performance to one interpretative frame to theorize human experience. On the other hand, focusing on both may bring together two interpretative frames whose relationship is more dialogical and dialectical. In her introduction to *Performance and Cultural Politics,* Elin Diamond proposes such a relationship between performance and performativity: When being is de-essentialized, whengender and even race are understood as fictional ontologies, modes of expression without true substance, the idea of performance comes to the fore. But performance both affirms and denies this evacuation of substance. In the sense that the ‘‘I’’ has no interior secure ego or core identity, ‘‘I’’ must always enunciate itself: **there is only performance of a self, not an external representation of an interior truth**. **But in the sense that I do my performance** in public, **for spectators who are interpreting** and/or performing with me, **there are** real effects, **meanings** solicited or **imposed that produce relations** in the real. Can performance make a difference? A performance, whether it inspires love or loathing, often consolidates cultural or subcultural affiliations, and these affiliations, might be as regressive as they are progressive. The point is, as soon as performativity comes to rest on *a* performance, questions of embodiment and political effects, all become discussible. Performance [. . .] is precisely the site in which concealed or dissimulated conventions might be investigated.When performativity materializes as performance in that risky and dangerous negotiation between doing (a reiteration of norms) and a thing done(discursive conventions that frame our interpretations),between somebody’s body and the conventions of embodiment, we have access to cultural meanings and critique. Performativity [. . .] must be rooted in the materiality and historical density of performance. (5, emphasis in original) I quote Diamond at length here because of the implications her construals of performance and performativity have for reinstating subjectivity and agency through the performance of identity. Although fleeting and ephemeral, these performances may activate a politics of subjectivity. The performance of self is not only a performance/construction of identity for/toward an ‘‘out there’’ or merely an attachment or ‘‘taking up’’ (Butler, *Gender* 145) of a predetermined, discursively contingent identity. **It is** also **a performance of** self for the self in a moment of **self-reflexivity that** has the potential to **transform one’s view** of self **in relation to the world.** People have a need to exercise control over the production of their images so that they feel empowered. For the disenfranchised, the recognition, construction and maintenance of self-image and cultural identity function to sustain, even when social systems fail to do so. Granted, formations/ **performances of identity** may simply reify oppressive systems, but they may alsocontest and **subvert dominant** meaning **systems.** When gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgendered people of color ‘‘talk back,’’ whether using the ‘‘tools of the master’’ (Lorde 110) or the vernacular on the street, their voices, singularly or collectively, do not exist in some vacuous wasteland of discursivity. As symbolic anthropologist Victor Turner suggests, their **performances** are not simple reflectors or expressions of culture or even of changing culture but **may** themselves **be active *agencies* of change**, representing the eye by which culture sees itself and the drawing board on which creative actors sketch out what they believe to be more apt or interesting ‘‘designs for living.’’ [. . .] Performative reflexivity is a condition in which a sociocultural group, or its most perceptive members, acting representatively, turn, bend, or reflect back upon themselves, upon the relations, actions, symbols, meanings, codes, roles, statuses, social structures, ethical and legal rules, and other sociocultural components which make up their public selves. (24, my emphasis) Turner’s theory of performative cultural reflexivity suggests a transgressive aspect of performative identity that neither dissolves identity into a fixed ‘‘I’’ nor presumes a monolithic ‘‘we.’’ Rather, Turner’s assertions suggest that social beings ‘‘look back’’ and ‘‘look forward’’ in a manner that wrestles with the ways in which that commu- nity exists in the world and theorizes that existence. As Cindy Patton warns, not everyone who claims an identity does so in the ways critics of essentialist identity claim they do (181). Theories of **performance**, as opposed to theories of performativity, also take into account the context and historical moment of performance (Strine 7). We need to account for the temporal and spatial specificity of performance not only to frame its existence, but also to name the ways in which it signifies. Such an analysiswould acknowledge the discursivity of subjects, but it would also **‘‘unfix’’ the discursively constituted subject as always already a pawn of power**. Although many queer theorists appropriate Foucault to substantiate the imperialism of power, Foucault himself acknowledges that discourse has the potential to disrupt power: Discourses are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it, any more than silences are. We must make allowances for the complex and unstable process whereby **discourse can be** both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance,a **stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy**. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, *but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it.* (100–101, my emphasis) Although people of color may not have theorized our lives in Foucault’s terms, we have used discourse in subversive ways because it was necessary for our survival. **Failure to ground discourse in materiality is to privilege the position of those who**se subjectivity and agency, **outside the realm of gender and sexuality, have never been subjugated**. The tendency of many lesbians, bisexuals, gays, and transgendered people of color is to unite around a racial identity at a moment when their subjectivity is already under erasure.

The aff is necessarily key – policies are always pragmatic

Overview to topicality

1. Cross apply Smith – you force debaters to engage with racist institutions without interrogating their every day violence and silence alternative views of the topics. The state co-opts resistance strategies like the 1AC *[contextualize example]* – proves you are silencing the 1AC because topical version of the aff will never exist. Also excludes marginalized debaters who have to confront every day violence of the USFG. This outweighs - accessibility is a multiplier, your impacts don’t matter if they only apply to a privileged elite. *Also, Smith reconceptualizes fairness as material conditions, not just a neutral playing field*
2. Cross apply DSRB – Policymaking causes us to become spectators to oppression because we give our agency to the USFG and ignore our own roles in oppression. Turns you impact – we become bad policy makers.
3. You could have engaged: Cap, anthro, antiblackness, cede the political all respond to the aff

## A2 Solvency Advocate

Counter interp: Debaters may advocate for an advocacy without a carded solvency advocate.

I meet

Net Benefit

#### Forcing plans to have solvency advocates makes debate a echochamber of already produced information – we should focus on knowledge production, not knowledge regurgitation in order to create productive change.

**DSRB 12[[18]](#footnote-18)**

Dr. Reid-Binkley: Now here is the fear. If that was the only answer, the debate community would do research, but it would be just to cut cards and nothing really would change. So it can’t stop at research, but that is literally step one: go do some reading. That would really help you have a language and a vocabulary for talking when you are engaging these teams that will produce very good debates. So when people say that they don’t think that what performance/movement teams are doing is intellectual, it’s because they have already decided that they are anti-intellectual. Whereas they are very much so intellectuals, as a matter of fact they are few of the debaters in our community producing scholarship rather than regurgitating it. **Our very frame of reference on** how to engage in **debate is about the regurgitation of information, rather than the production of it**. That is where I think we have gone wrong, which is also why we are not having good – we are not able to advertise to our administrations in a way that makes debate something that administrations really really want to support and fully fund. And the reason is because **we made it** such **this isolated solipsistic game that people who are really interested in knowledge production don’t necessarily see their relationship to it**. We are losing tenure stream jobs for debate directors in our community. The reason is because our community is becoming more and more disconnected from the academy. What we can do in terms of how we produce scholarship for debate, in debate rounds, is that **we need to change our focus from the regurgitation of information** that is already **produced in the academy to** an engagement with it so that we are **producing new knowledge**. So **rather than saying the only way you can have a plan** for what to do different with democracy assistance **is to find what the USFG has already defined it as**, **and** get authors who, you have to **find a solvency advocate** for whatever change you are going to make. So **somebody has already produced that idea and gotten it into print.** Stupid! Stupid. We are so smart, this community of people, I have never been around smarter people than the people in the debate community. That’s why I find it exciting. Because I’m really smart, so I enjoy talking to other smart people. And, we are just not making use of the intelligence, the intellectual power that is at a debate tournament, especially when you get to the top of the game, it is amazingly powerful. I have met graduate students and professors that are nowhere near as smart as some of our undergraduates their senior year at the height of their ability to compete. Just have not. Odekirk: Amen. Dr. Reid-Brinkley: Given that this is the case, why are we not producing knew knowledge? **Rather than coming at a plan as I have to have a solvency advocate who has already defined this, and I have to define this in the context of exactly how the USFG has previously defined it**. I think **we should be producing new arguments about what democracy assistance should look like and be like** through the USFG. Sorather than having a solvency advocate **you would have evidentiary support** to change parts **of your argument**. Just like writing an academic paper. If all academic papers were was regurgitation of someone else’s argument, it would never get published. **The** whole **point of** academic **scholarship is** for you **to identify what’s being said** in the field or around a particular issue **and what’s missing from that, and then** you do something to **demonstrate why that thing that’s missing in that scholarship should be there, and** you make an argument about **how we need to expand our understanding** of this situation. Does that make sense to you? So **it doesn’t make sense that the ways** we in which **we engage in policy making is to simply chain it out to what something else someone has already thought of**. When we have all this intellectual power, **we should be producing new policy**. That would be the change. **That would change our very way of thinking about what the game is that we are playing**, and what its potential connection is to both the academy but also politics. And **that would create the space for teams who want to talk about anti-blackness or** teams that want to talk about the defining nature of **gender and how we engage in policy**. It would allow all these different things because **our** very **frame** of reference **for understanding what the game is that we are engaging in would change**, **it would open up fields of literature**, it would make sense that people are saying we need a three tier methodology where we look at organic intellectuals we look at other scholars and we look at our personal experience, guess what, that’s how you write a [ed] academic paper now. Odekirk: Strong. Dr. Reid-Brinkley: How about you just get with the program? Odekirk: Its so obvious, but I’ve never seen it. You are so right, but I’m having a major ‘a-ha moment’ right now, to be honest. You are so [ed] right. Its also so been there my whole life, but I have literally never thought that, and.. duh. Dr. Reid-Brinkley: Yeah, that’s how I feel about it, like duh! Know what I mean? Then we have a much better argument to make to our administrations about the significance of our programs, we can start connecting debate tournament final rounds to what’s going on in public policy research institutions. What we produce could literally provide an entrance for our arguments to actually affect public policy because of the intellectual power our community holds. Why are we not making use of the things that would get our programs support? It doesn’t make sense to me. That’s why debate is collapsing to this very small small small society. Once that collapse between the NDT and CEDA happened, have you watched the community shrink over time? It just has gotten smaller. And it will continue to get smaller, because we will continue to disconnect ourselves from the academy. But why are we not in conversations on a consistent basis with our authors? Duh!? This is why whats happening in black debate. Is more fascinating than what is happening anywhere else. I’m really interested in Spurlock interviewing Spanos about debate. Im interested in the fact that Damiyr & Miguel, members of the Towson squad, me and some other black debate people got invited by Dylan Rodriguez to appear at the American Studies Conference to talk about what’s happening in debate and activism and scholarship around blackness in issues like prison, etc. I’m interested in that, because these scholars are like ‘woah, yall are talking about this stuff here?’ and they are like watching video links of the students debating, and like they’re on our Resistance homepage. I have created a Facebook Resistance page that’s private that all of the movement and its coalition members are on. So, I get requests, I put you on if you are a coalition member, Wilderson is on there, Dylan Rodriguez is on there, Sexton is on there, you know what I mean? And, we just…that’s what debate should look like. **Academics should be participating, they shouldn’t control it,** but you should be able to come talk to us in our theories about the topic. How about that? **You don’t need to write evidence** for you **about the Arab Spring for me to describe** to you **why my work on African American culture and hip hop are relevant** to thinking about what’s going on in the Arab Spring. I simply am teaching you to chain my theory through another example. That’s how you write an academic paper. You take somebody else’s theory, and you don’t just map it exactly on to what it is that you are working on. You have to figure out what the relationship is between the two. That’s the kind of stuff we could produce as a community, every year, on topics. We just are not taking advantage of that. And, in that process, because of how we have defined debate, it is exclusionary. We do have these ideal debaters who look like white males, white straight men with money and class, and those white men who don’t fit that, are few and far between. They often get up there, but they still is sort of like a little weird, because you don’t perform white masculinity middle to upper class in an appropriate manner, so they are cool with you, but you’re still freaky. We make those kinds of judgments because we are just so insulated. Our thinking is so small. Smaller than it what we should and could be. And, that’s my debate future. That’s my vision of what it could look like, my dream that lets me walk around at tournaments and be okay with the fact that supposedly I’m despised by the elites, higher-ups in the community, and people that used to be my friends, and that would speak to me on a regular basis and that I would run up to and hug, avoid my eyes in the hallway. Or that I’m not qualified to write about debate, but neither is Spanos because he was an outsider, but I’m not qualified to write about it because I’m an insider. But, Casey Harrigan, and Jarrod Atchison, and Pannetta are…there is no question of their qualifications. I’m sorry, I thought I got a PhD from the number one program in rhetoric in the country. I’m sorry, I thought that was the case. I thought I was a national award winning scholar, for my writing, published writing. I thought that was the case, and that would make me somehow qualified to talk about debate a little bit… but, clearly not. But, once your black. Once you say your black, then your biased.

#### This outweighs

#### Destroys the value to debate as an activity because we aren’t learning how to produce information but rather to repeat it word for word - counter interp is key to creating new policies and change outside of the current limits of knowledge production

#### Inclusion – the interp locks debaters into defining policies just as the US has defined them – prevents change in debate and excludes arguments that are dismissed as illegitimate

#### And, this impact turns predictability – the fact that certain plans are predictability is because we hear them over and over again – unpredictability is key to actually having to think critically and apply neg arguments

## A2 Extra T Bad

I meet – We give back the land as a way for the US to prohibit the production of nuclear power

Counter interp: The aff may defend the resolution and an additional plank of giving back the land

Net benefit is K education – your interp limits our analysis of the resolution to a stasis point of nuclear power good versus bad while Churchill evidence says that these pragmatic question will always re-entrench settler colonialism because we can ignore the real question of whether the US should exist or not.

K Education > Topical education

1. No one remembers the details of the topic – that’s why we have google, but the critical thinking skills of k education lasts for the rest of our lives which means it’s the most portable and long lasting skill
2. **Debate is a unique place to learn about critical education – if we only cared about fairness we would go flip coins all day but we debate because it is a unique place where we can learn about critical literature**

Overview to your standards –

1. PICs solve all abuse – you can read topical Das – all reasons why nuclear power is good turn the aff
2. Turn – counter interp is better for neg strategy because you have more ground and ways out – every extra plank in the aff we read is an extra advocacy you have Das to

## A2 Truth Testing

## A2 Policy Making

#### 1. The detached stance of the policy maker in debate divorces us from true advocacy. Simulations only serve to distance us from real world political participation  DSRB 08[[19]](#footnote-19)

Mitchell observes that **the stance of the policymaker in debate comes with a “sense of detachment** associated with the spectator posture.”115 In other words, **its participants are able to engage in debates where they are able to distance themselves from the events that are the subjects of debates. Debaters can throw around terms like** torture, terrorism, **genocide** and nuclear war **without blinking**. Debate simulations can only serve to distance the debaters from real world participation in the political contexts they debate about. As William Shanahan remarks: …the topic established a relationship through interpellation that inhered irrespective of what the particular political affinities of the debaters were. The relationship was both political and ethical, and needed to be debated as such. **When we** blithely **call for U**nited **S**tates **F**ederal **G**overnment **policymaking, we are not immune to the colonialist legacy that establishes our place on this continent. We cannot wish away the** horrific **atrocities** perpetrated everyday in our name simply by refusing to acknowledge these implications” (emphasis in original).116 The “objective” stance of the policymaker is an impersonal or imperialist persona. **The policymaker relies upon “acceptable” forms of evidence, engaging in logical discussion, producing rational thoughts.** As Shanahan, and the Louisville debaters’ note, such a stance is integrally linked to the normative, historical and contemporary practices of power that produce and maintain varying networks of oppression. In other words, **the discursive practices of policy oriented debate are developed within, through and from systems of power and privilege.** Thus, **these practices are critically implicated in the maintenance of hegemony.** So, rather than seeing themselves as government or state actors, Jones and Green choose to perform themselves in debate, violating the more “objective” stance of the “policymaker” and require their opponents to do the same. Jones and Green argue that **debaters should ground their agency in what they are able to do as “individuals.”** Note the following statement from Green in the 2NC against Emory’s Allen and Greenstein (ranked in the “sweet sixteen”): “And then, another main difference is that our advocacy is grounded in our agency as individuals. **Their agency is grounded in what the US federal government, what the state should do.**”117 Citing Mitchell, Green argues further: We talk about, dead prez, talks about how the system ain’t gone change, unless we make it change. We’re talkin’ about what we as individuals should do. That’s why Gordon Mitchell talked about how when we lose our argumentative agency. **When we give our agency to someone else, we begin speaking of what the United States Federal Government should do, rather than what we do, that cause us to be spectators.** Its one of the most debilitating failures of contemporary education.118 As part of their commitment to the development of agency, each of the Louisville debaters engages in a recognition of their privilege, in an attempt to make their social locations visible and relevant to their rhetorical stance.

#### 2. The ideology of colonialism demands changing the way people think so that they come to accept colonialism as natural and normal.  Their demand to conform to a state-centered ideology that silences criticism of colonialism and rhetoric about how “the state is inevitable” is a way in which colonialism continues to thrive as ideology.

Peterson 92**[[20]](#footnote-20)**

In contrast, recent literature examines the states’ role in cultural and ideological productions that selectively shape our understanding of power and its effects. **Crucial to the state’s ability to rule** effectively **is “a claim to legitimacy, a means by which political organized subjection is simultaneously accomplished and concealed.”** These studies place in the foreground “**normalizing practices**,” surveillance, “information storage,” and routines and rituals of rules” that **makes the state’s coercive power by** effectuating rule indirectly and **rendering social hierarchies “natural.” Of note here is the state’s role in (re)configuring individual and collective identities, “new” histories, and “imagined communities**.” Studies of nationalism particularly reveal these converging practices. This literature examines not only what kinds of choices are made but how **numerous options are rendered invisible and/or erased**—how **alternatives are “forgotten” and legitimations of rule “naturalized**” and internalized. From this perspective, **states** matter “because their organizational configurations, along with their overall patterns of activity, affect political culture, **encourage some kinds of group formation and collective political actions (but not others), and make possible the raising of certain political issues (but not other).”** In sum, recent nonfeminist scholarship on the state, especially that of comparativists, is marked my commitments to historical, contextual, processual, interdisciplinary, and interpretative orientations. These commitments also surface repeatedly in feminist scholarship, and are visibly at work in this volume. More specifically, contributors elaborate and reframe themes and insights noted above by examining them through gender-sensitive lenses. By contrast, where neorealist accounts predominate in IR, the state continutes to be “taken for granted,” yielding less adequate theories of how the world we live in was made and how it is (“in reality”) reproduced.

#### 3. Turn – Effective policymaking necessarily entails exploring and problematizing how power structures such as colonialism effect actors and constrain policy outcomes.

Duvall 03[[21]](#footnote-21)

**The failure to develop alternative conceptualizations of power limits the ability** of international relations scholars **to understand how** global outcomes are produced and **how actors are differentially enabled and constrained to determine their fates**+ One certainly needs to know about the ability of actors to use resources to control the behavior of others+ The United States is able to use its military power to compel others to change their foreign policies, and in the contemporary period transnational activists have been able to shame multinational corporations and abusive governments to alter their economic and human rights policies, respectively **Any discussion of power in** international politics, then, **must include a consideration of how, why, and when some actors have “power over” others**+ Yet **one** also **needs to consider the** enduring **structures and processes of global life that enable and constrain the ability of actors to shape their fates and their futures**+ The extension of sovereignty from the West to the developing world gave decolonized states the authority to voice their interests and represent themselves, and the emergence of a human rights discourse helped to make possible the very category of human rights activists who give voice to human rights norms+ Analysis of power in international relations, then, must include a consideration of how social structures and processes generate differential social capacities for actors to define and pursue their interests and ideals+10

#### 4. I control the internal link. The effectiveness of policymaking as an education tool depends on the ability to critique the assumptions endorsed by the affirmative. Policy makers need to defend their method.

Bruschke and Warner 01**[[22]](#footnote-22)**

Second, **empowered students must be social critics**. Essentially, they must apply the same dialectical stance toward the world they live in and (he public policies they are asked to live by and participate in enacting. **Academic debate facilitates the development of students as social critics because of its policy oriented and research intensive nature.** Although learning to think dialectically certainly might have some transferable skill that would allow students to evaluate questions of governance, no such transfer is even necessary. **Students are directly debating questions of policy and evaluating the effectiveness, morality, and desirability of different governmental actions along with the possibility of non-governmental alternatives**. Because all debates begin with an affirmative indictment of the status quo, all policy debates invoke questions of what the current social order is like and how it can be improved. Even **when debating the negative**, **students** may **offer** "counter-plans" that provide alternative policy arrangements, **or philosophical critiques that ask the judge to "re-think" social orders and evaluate the affirmative** plan **in a new light**. The research intensive nature of debate facilitates all these processes, and not only requires that students develop a broad base of knowledge about particular policy questions but also teaches them how to obtain knowledge on any policy question that they encounter.

# A2 PICs

Cooption DA – PICs co-opts the position and movement of the 1AC which is a tactic of the white settler – you can control dissent and claim that you get all the benefits which reabsorbs indigenous scholarship into white pedogagy—that’s Tuck and Fernandez

## A2 You/your authors are not indigenous

#### [Glendinning] It’s not important who is indigenous or who is not—claims of identity prevent us from engaging in discussions for common goals and dooms any strategies to failure

Glendinning 03 GLENDINNING, 2003 (CHELLIS, SCHOLAR OF ECOPSYCHOLOGY AND AUTHOR, WHEN TECHNOLOGY WOUNDS, THIS TAKEN FROM ON THE JUSTICE OF CHARGING BUFFALO)

Before I continue, however, I will briefly address one of the criticisms waged by those who do not support Churchill's scholarship and/or case because of the red-herring issue of identity. Because of my commitment to Indigenous Peoples, I endorse the truth no matter where I find it. **Whether** Professor **Churchill is Indigenous or not**, is enrolled or not, or is of a certain blood quantum, **is of little or no consequence to me since I am**, and always have been, **centrally concerned with pro-Indigenous activity.**3 While I do understand why some of my colleagues are concerned (in some cases obsessed) with "identity," **I rarely have found identity discussions** in the academy **to be critical**, in-depth, coherent **exercises leading to substantive outcomes that advance Indigenous scholarship and the rights of our peoples**; instead **the issue generally serves as a flashpoint for finger pointing**: "who is Indigenous?" "they don't have a blood-quantum level on their CDIB card," "they're only a quarter, an eighth, or a sixteenth," "they act white," "they look too white (or black)," "they are married to a white person," or pick another. Indeed, **instead of assisting us in concentrating our intellectual resources on the pursuit of common goals that support the Indigenous communities** to whom we are responsible, **identity remains a vortex for the poisoning of our departments** and our discipline, and for undermining our work for the people. In the "old days" many of our tribes who were brilliantly utilitarian made a regular practice of dealing with identity by formally adopting (nonmember) Indigenous and non-Indigenous persons who exhibited behaviors and thinking that empowered the nation. Many also made a practice of formally banishing those who endangered the group. It is too bad that, with all our PhDs, we have not found similar avenues to empower ourselves in the academy.]

# A2 Ks

## “Paralyze” K

#### Reject the neg – The tagline of the Zizek evidence in the kritik is “By mystifying the very nature of the ecological problem we paralyze action which turns case.” Using the term “paralyze” in every day debate perpetuates ableism and creates an exclusionary debate space – independent reason to vote, the judge has to set norms to make debate accessible, prerequisite to debate itself.

**The Talon[[23]](#footnote-23)**

There’s no doubt that **“paralyzed”** and “crippling” have evocative value when they’re used as metaphors, but they’re **problematic** terms **that support** a culture of **ableism**. Ableism is a system of oppression based on the idea that people with disabilities are inferior to non-disabled people. This means that there are a set of institutions, cultural practices, and attitudes that discriminate against people with disabilities. Our society is constructed to be ableist as well as disabling. For example, a lack of elevators disables people from accessing the floors of a building. This says less about a person’s ability to climb stairs, and more about the way ableism is built in society. It’s ableist to use the term “crippled” because it contributes to the idea that people with disabilities are “less competent.” **Using the term**s “crippled” and **“paralyzed”** also **supports the construction of disability as outside of what is** considered **“normal.”** Saying something like, “paralyzed by your beauty” is ableist because **it’s being used to describe something unusual**, or out of the ordinary. **To use** “crippled” or **“paralyzed” in everyday language is to support the construction of disability as the binary opposite of what’s “normal,”** good, or desirable. Other ableist binaries include regular/irregular, or healthy/pathological. Using the term “cripple” undermines the material consequences faced by people with disabilities. It suggests that people who are physically challenged face only physical barriers, not social, political, or systemic ones. It supports the idea that any problems related to disability stem from the disability. According to disability studies scholar Simi Linton, being placed in the category of disability is what disqualifies a person from “normal” achievements, such as supporting themselves financially. In hiring practices, for example, there’s a tendency to fixate on what a person with disabilities can’t do. **When we focus on what they can’t do, it makes it easy to justify things like paying them less, or not hiring them at all**. **Focusing on what they can’t do also shifts the focus away from what they can do**, or how their disability could be accommodated. **Disability is a label that categorizes certain people as “abnormal,”** but that doesn’t mean that a disabled person is incapable of participating in society or doing work. That’s why meeting the accessibility needs of people with disabilities is important — it restores their individual agency to manage for themselves and contribute to society. Not everyone falls under the disability category, but everyone is affected by **ableism** (though differently so). Our culture is one that **makes people vulnerable to marginalization when they don’t fit into particular constructions of normativity**, such as the able-bodied, heterosexual, white cisgender male. In this way, ableism follows the same logic as colonialism, racism, gender oppression, homophobia, and other forms of oppression. **The circulation of the word**s “crippled” and **“paralyzed” in our culture continues the oppression of many communities and people based on their identities**. In addition to looking at how ableism works in culture, it’s important to be mindful of how normativity operates in different spaces. While it’s one thing to see ableism in mainstream media, it’s another to see it in social justice movements. For example, a social justice march that covers many kilometers isn’t necessarily accessible to folks who use mobility devices! Building cross-movement solidarity in anti-oppression means being mindful of ableism. It requires that accessibility needs be met. If ableism and accessibility aren’t addressed in social justice movements, then what spaces will they be addressed in? In general, **accessibility means enabling all bodies barrier-free access to spaces**. In terms of physical accommodations, this means ensuring that a space is accessible with ramps or elevators for people who use mobility devices. It also requires providing the appropriate signage to accommodate the needs of people with disabilities. Like many terms that have been used to oppress people, “crippled” can be reclaimed as a form of resistance. In disability justice movements, “crippled” is being reclaimed by some people who have been oppressed by the identity category. There’s krip-hop, where artists with disabilities use hip-hop as a means to share their experiences. Cripple punks have also reclaimed “crip,” by fiercely rejecting ableism and other forms of oppression!

## A2 Pschoanalysis

#### No link – We don’t give meaning to the ecological crisis – we say that nuclear waste is put on Indigenous land and that’s probably a bad thing

1. Perm: The affirmatives decolonial method doesn’t foreclose their analysis of the real – our analysis of the colonized body as the negative other to United States is in line with the alternative, and proves the permutation solves

#### Walks are better than lying on analyst’s couches – relating to the outside world is cool!

Deleuze and Guattari 72 (Anti-Oedipus, pgs.179-181)

Given these conditions, what is there to say about the relationship between ethnology and psychoanalysis? Must we be content with an uncertain parallelism where each contemplates the other with perplexity, placing in opposition two irreducible sectors of symbolism? A social sector of symbols, and a sexual sector that would constitute a kind of private universal, a kind of individual-universal? (Transversals between the two, since social symbolism can become a sexual material, and sexuality, a ritual of social aggregation.) But the problem is too theoretical when posed this way. Practically speaking,?" Of what use is it not only to the ethnologist, but what purpose does it serve and how does it work in the very formation that makes use of the symbol?\* Whatever may be the meaning of a thing, **the psychoanalyst often claims to explain to the ethnologist the meaning of the symbol: it means phallus, castration, Oedipus. But the ethnologist asks other questions, and sincerely asks himself of what use can psychoanalytic interpretations be to me? Hence the duality is displaced, it is no longer between two sectors, but between two kinds of questions, "What does it mean?" and "What purpose does it serve**it is not certain that the thing serves any useful purpose whatever. It is possible, for example, that Oedipus serves no useful purpose, either for psychoanalysts or for the unconscious. And to what use could the phallus be put, since it is inseparable from the castration that deprives us of its use? Of course we are told not to confuse the signified with the signifier. But does the signifier take us beyond the question, "What does it mean?" Is it anything other than this same question, only this time barred? This is still the domain of representation. The true misunderstandings, the misunderstandings between ethnologists (or Hellenists) and psychoanalysts, do not come from a faulty knowledge or recognition of the unconscious, of sexuality, of the phallic nature of symbolism. In theory, everyone could reach an agreement on this point: everything is sexual or sex-influenced (sexue) from one end to the other. Everyone knows this, beginning with the users. The practical misunderstandings come rather from the profound difference between the two sorts of questions. Without always formulating it clearly, the ethnologists and the Hellenists think that a symbol is not defined by what it means, but by what it does and by what is done with it. It always means the phallus or something similar, except that what it means does not tell what purpose it serves. In a word, there is no ethnological interpretation for the simple reason that there is no ethnographic material: there are only uses and functionings (des fonctionnements). On this point, it could be that psychoanalysts have much to learn from ethnologists: about the unimportance of "What does it mean?" When Hellenists place themselves in opposition to the Freudian Oedipus, it should not be thought that they put forward other interpretations to replace the psychoanalytic interpretation. It could be that ethnologists and Hellenists will compel psychoanalysts for their part to make a similar discovery: namely, that there is no unconscious material either, nor is there a psychoanalytic interpretation, but only uses, analytic uses of the syntheses of the unconscious, which do not allow themselves to be defined by an assignment of a signifier any more than by the determination of signifieds. How it works is the sole question. Schizoanalysis foregoes all interpretation because it foregoes discovering an unconscious material: the unconscious does not mean anything. On the other hand the unconscious constructs machines, which are machines of desire, whose use and functioning schizoanalysis discovers in their immanent relationship with social machines. The unconscious does not speak, it engineers. It is not expressive or representative, but productive. A symbol is nothing other than a social machine that functions as a desiring-machine, a desiring-machine that functions within the social machine, an investment of the social machine by desire. It has often been said and demonstrated that an institution cannot be explained by its use, any more than an organ can. Biological formations and social formations are not formed in the same way in which they function. Nor is there a biological, sociological, linguistic, etc., functionalism at the level of large determinate aggregates (des grands ensembLes specifies). But the same does not hold true in the case of desiring-machines as molecular elements: there, use, functioning, production, and formation are one and the same process. And it is this synthesis of desire that, under certain determinate conditions, explains the molar aggregates (les ensembLes moLaires) with their specific use in a biological, social, or linguistic field. This is because the large molar machines presuppose pre-established connections that are not explained by their functioning, since the latter results from them. Only desiring machines produce connections according to which they function, and function by improvising and forming the connections. A molar functionalism is therefore a functionalism that did not go far enough, that did not reach those regions where desire engineers, independently of the macroscopic nature of what it is engineering: organic, social, linguistic, etc., elements, all tossed into the same pot to stew. The only unities multiplicities that functionalism must know are the desiring-machines themselves and the configurations they form in all the sectors of a field of production (the "total fact"). A magical chain brings together plant life, pieces of organs, a shred of clothing, an image of daddy, formulas and words: we shall not ask what it means, but what kind of machine is assembled in this manner-what kind of flows and breaks in the flows, in relation to other breaks and other flows.

#### Psychoanalysis fails unless coupled with material action – means the perm is key

Homer 96**[[24]](#footnote-24)**

It is at this point that I wish to draw back and resist the temptations of both postmarxism and postmodernism. And it is also at this point that I wish to return to my second concern with this particular historical conjucture of May '68. I have emphasised the rapprochement that took place between Marxism and psychoanalysis post 1968 but what I have omitted from the discussion thus far is that these were but two of a much broader and more complex alliance, an alliance that was informed, above all, by feminism as well as a wide ranging critique of philosophical foundationalism and the politicised semiotics of Barthes and Kristeva. Psychoanalysis, and this is for me where it ties back to questions of pedagogy, was but one amongst a number of discourses and it was the specific conjuncture of these distinct discourses that created the critical space within which they operated. Furthermore, the political dimension of this project was not the practice of theoretical discourse per se but rather the intervention of theoretical discourse in the terrain of ideology. For instance, it is not simply a case of how to teach psychoanalysis in the University that is the issue of this conference but 'what' we are teaching with it. **If** psychoanalysis creates a radical, critical and destablising space within the Universities (and if it doesn't I see no point in teaching it), then it does so, I believe, in conjunction with other discourses. Psychoanalysis is not the answer but the problem and what is at stake is the political implications of psychoanalytic theory and practice. I will come back to this in my concluding remarks. What I now want to do is to restage this debate and attempt to forestall what I identified above as the theoretical and political impasse of post-marxism in the light of the possibility of a psychoanalytic theory of ideology. For if psychoanalysis has anything to offer political theory in general or the politics of representation in particular it is in the field of ideology. According to Zizek the psychoanalytic theory of ideology has regressed somewhat from Althusser's first exploratory steps. Let me be quite clear here, I do not see Althusser as the final word in this debate. His reformulation of the Marxian concept of ideology as the imaginary representation of the subjects real conditions of existence was notoriously under-theorised, just as his use and understanding of Lacan was seriously questionable. What I want to suggest is more modest, that is, that Althusser mapped a certain problematic of the subject, representation and ideology that we remain within but now all too often seek to evade or obfuscate. I now seem to read a great deal, for instance, about subjectivity and representation but very little about ideology and the political implications of, say, multiple subject positions, or, the subject in process. Zizek articulated this problem succinctly in The Sublime Object of Ideology, when he suggested that the elision of the Althusserian/Lacanian debate masked a deeper problematic. To quote Zizek: There is something enigmatic in the sudden eclipse of the Althusserian school: it cannot be explained away in terms of a theoretical defeat. - It is more as if there were**,** in Althusser's theory, a traumatic kernel which had to be quickly forgotten, 'repressed', it is an effective case of theoretical amnesia. This 'traumatic kernel' is, for Zizek, that impossible encounter with the Real, whilst that effective moment of theoretical amnesia, I want to argue, is the political. The critique of the Althusserian position is now well established and in my view substantively correct, so I will restrict myself to those criticisms which pertain to Zizek's work, principally Althusser's failure to successfully think through the relationship between his ideological apparatuses and the interpellation of individuals as ideological subjects. Briefly, Althusser never theorised how the ideological structures he identified were internalised by subjects and, furthermore, Althusser failed to account for the fact that his interpellated subjects were always already ideological subjects in the same sense that they had been subjected to prior subjectification. According to Zizek, therefore, Althusser's error was to locate ideology in the wrong order. For Marxism ideology is always a question of consciousness, or, more precisely of false consciousness. For Zizek, however, ideology does not work at the level of consciousness but rather below it, - it is not an illusion masking reality but a fundamental misrecognition at the level of social reality itself. As Zizek puts it: The illusion is not on the side of knowledge, it is already on the side of reality itself, of what people are doing. What they do not know is their social reality itself, their activity, is guided by an illusion, by a fetishistic inversion.11 What Zizek calls the ideological fantasy unconsciously structures our social reality. Such an account of ideology, I might add, is not in-itself inconsistent with certain variants within Marxism. What psychoanalysis adds to the situation is an insistence on the structural necessity of the failure of ideological interpellation. The internalisation of ideological structures can never fully succeed,... ... there is always a residue, a leftover, a stain of traumatic irrationality and senselessness sticking to it, and that this leftover, far from hindering the full submission of the subject to the ideological command, is the very condition of it.11 Ideology, then, is not an illusion which masks social reality. On the contrary, it is a fantasy-structure which serves to support that very reality and thereby to mask a more intractable impossible real kernel. The function of ideology', writes Zizek, 'is not to offer us a point of escape from our reality but to offer us the social reality itself as an escape from some traumatic, real kernel'.13 Zizek's manoeuvre is significant and I believe opens the way for a properly psychoanalytic theory of ideology. What he highlights is not only the bad faith of ideology, its imaginary illusory dimension, but also its pleasure, that inseparable and unaccountable element of surplus-enjoyment on which the function of ideology hinges. Indeed, it is the very aim of ideology to conceal the element of surplusenjoyment proper to the ideological form. There is in Zizek's formulation, then, a certain compensatory exchange. We are not merely duped into believing that this is the best of all possible worlds, that there is no alternative, but gain something in a very 'real' sense. That is, in the sense of what Zizek identifies as the radical ambiguity of the real as both a non-symbolized kernel that returns and disrupts the symbolic and at the same time as contained in that very symbolic form, as 'immediately rendered by this form'.14 It is this notion of radical ambiguity in relation to the aim and function of ideology that I want to hang onto and to attempt to link up with a second aspect of Zizek's theory.

## A2 Wilderson

#### Perm – do both. Settler colonialism is integral to the formation of slavery and its afterlife—anti-black racism is an inadequate frame absent understanding the role of colonialism which turns solvency

King 13**[[25]](#footnote-25)**

We must consider that **Settler colonialism shapes** **and constitutes Black life**, specifically slavery and its afterlife in America. **While slavery and anti-Black racism should be active and robust analytic frame**s that guide Black Studies and help us understand Black subjectivity in the Western Hemisphere, **settler colonialism also structures Black life. The genocide of Native peoples, the perpetual making of Settler space and Settler subjectivity**—as unfettered self actualization**—do not immediately stop existing as forms of power when they run into Black bodies. The way that settler colonial power looks and manifests itself** just changes; it does not stop. **Settler colonialism**, as a subjectless discourse, **is a form of productive power that touches all that live in the US and Settler colonial nations**.30 Though it touches and shapes everyone’s life it does so in very different ways. For the purposes of my own research I am arguing that **settler colonialism’s normalizing power enacts genocide against Native peoples (disappears Native people) but it also shapes and structures antiBlack racism. The ontological positions that were created by slavery,** specifically the Slave **are still alive and well** however, settler colonial power intersects with, works through and structures the repressive and productive power that makes the Black captive fungible and socially dead. Throughout, In the Clearing poses the question, in what ways does settler colonial power help structure slavery and anti-Black racism? This project ultimately argues that slavery and anti-Black racism are not adequate to fully understand the material and discursive processes that create Blackness in all of its embodied genres in North America. **Slavery and anti-Black racism are also not the only repressive powers that make the Black body abject, fungible and situated at the outer limits of being-ness.** **Both** slavery and settler colonialism structure modernity and need to be fully conceptualized as forms of power that help constitute Blackness. **Conceptualizing the ways that settler colonialism and slavery co-constitute one another is an essential component of this dissertation.**

#### Thus, a methodological bracketing of the dominant centrality of the black/white binary is necessary in order to grapple with settler colonialism – the binary reduces indigenity to merely racial identity, erasing the originary and ongoing moment of displacement – instead of the traditional frame of race as cultural or bodily identity, we must theorize settler colonialism through the social structures by which possession of indigenous lands is made ordinary

Rifkin 14 – Associate Professor of English & WGS @ UNC-Greensboro

(Mark, ‘Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance,’ pp. 19-25)

**Over the past twenty years, scholars have given greater prominence to slavery and its legacies and** the intertwined processes of (re)producing blackness and whiteness as ubiquitous features of U.S. history, politics, and culture, understanding these dynamics as pervading all aspects of national life. In Playing in the Dark (1992), Toni Morrison asks the landmark ques- tion of how the presence of black people and the practices and legacies of enslavement might be registered in texts that do not foreground either, pro- viding “the very manner by which American literature distinguishes itself as a coherent entity” (6). She demonstrates how texts illustrate “the impact of racism on those who perpetuate it” (11), “even, and especially, when American texts are not ‘about’ Africanist presences or characters or narra- tive or idiom” (46).26 This conceptual and methodological turn helps pro- pel the emergence of immensely rich and important developments within nineteenth-century Americanist scholarship, enabling a centering of slavery and its legacies, blackness as a mode of racialization and anti-black racism, and African American experience within the field as a whole by indicating their relevance across the entire spectrum of U.S. political economy, cultural production, and social life. While *Settler Common Sense* owes an immeasur- able debt to this set of conceptual and methodological innovations, these salutary developments also have had the effect of reaffirming what has been characterized as the “black/white binary.”27 Even more than taking the specifics of one vector of racialization and the modes of oppression that sustain it (and that it sustains) and potentially generalizing them to all forms of racialization in ways that may ill-fit other histories, the black/white binary tends to foreground citizenship, rights, and belonging to the nation, miscasting Indigenous self-representations and political aims in ways that make them illegible.28¶ From a perspective organized around bondage, emancipation, labor, polit- ical participation, and formal versus substantive freedom, Native articulations of peoplehood, sovereignty, and collective landedness can appear confusing at best and at worst are taken as indicative of an investment in a form of reactionary ethnic nationalism. As Byrd argues in The Transit of Empire, “The generally accepted theorizations of racialization in the United States have, in the pursuit of equal rights and enfranchisements, tended to be sited along the axis of inclusion/exclusion. . . . When the remediation of the coloniza- tion of American Indians is framed through discourses of racialization that can be redressed by further inclusion into the nation-state, there is a significant failure to grapple with the fact that such discourses further reinscribe the original colonial injury” (xxiii). More than simply leaving out Indigenous political aims, the substitution of racialization for colonization “masks the territoriality of conquest by assigning colonization to the racialized body . . . [;] land rights disappear into U.S. territoriality as indigenous identity becomes a racial identity and citizens of colonized indigenous nations become internal ethnic minorities within the colonizing nation-state” (xxiv), a process “of making racial what is international” (125).29 Such “conflation,” confusion, obfuscation results in a tendency in American studies to treat Native presence and violence against Native peoples as a kind of originary sin of white supremacy that can be quickly noted on the way to a discussion of other apparently more significant and enduring modes of racial domination. Byrd observes that American studies often “sees it as enough to challenge the wilderness as anything but vacant” while then “relegat[ing] American Indians to the site of the already-doneness that begins to linger as unwelcome guests to the future” (20). She suggests that a critical and historical lens developed to examine modes of racialization—a form of study itself overdetermined by the black/white binary—not only cannot grasp the contours and stakes of indigeneity but translates it in ways that redouble colonial incorporation.30¶ Scholarship within nineteenth-century American literary studies that has sought to consider both settlement and slavery often displaces the former on the way to the latter in ways that leave aside the question of the self- determination of Indigenous peoples, as well as the process by which the occupation of Native lands comes to be lived and represented as the “ready made” of everyday nonnative possibility. In Captivity and Sentiment, Michelle Burnham suggests that the popularity of narratives of captivity from the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries (including slave narratives) can be understood in terms of the ways they worked to manage the “resis- tant and unrecuperable surplus of cultural difference always left over by the process of cultural exchange” (9): “The experience of captivity across cul- tural boundaries transports them [captives, the texts produced by and about them, and the readers of such narratives] to interstitial zones of contact, where dominant values, standards, and modes of representation fail, alter, or are brought to crisis” (170). Characterizing “boundaries” as cultural makes “space” and “zone” almost entirely metaphorical, delinked from actual places, land claims, and modes of occupancy, abstracting from the particular kinds of sociopolitical mappings at play in different instances in order to place them in the same analytic frame. “Culture” comes to mark the difference of nonwhiteness per se rather than indexing the normalization of specific formations of residence, land tenure, and political belonging. Ezra Tawil’s The Making of Racial Sentiment similarly enfolds American Indians into a critical narrative that defers questions of Native sovereignty, reading rep- resentations of settler–Indigenous conflict as a coded way of addressing slavery. He explores “the attribution of certain qualities of character and emotion to race,” which he characterizes as “racial sentiment” (11): “In the most general terms, it stands to reason that the Indian and the slave could operate at times as analogous figures in Anglo-American political discourse. Both could be represented as members of alien populations that vexed the smooth operation of Anglo-American power on the continent” (59). He later indicates that “the thematics of Indian dispossession was one aspect of a contemporary discussion about property conflict in which the politics of slavery, no less than Indian land ownership, was at stake” (86), naming Native “dispossession” as a struggle around “property” in ways that allow the contested geopolitics of sovereignty to be cast as similar in kind (“analo- gous”) to “the slavery debate.” In Fugitive Empire, Andy Doolen observes that the book’s title “invokes the heretofore hidden imperialism . . . that shaped our culture and institutions in America’s formative years” while then indicating that he seeks to attend “to the histories of slaves and the insti- tutions of slavery” (xiii). For Doolen, U.S. imperialism refers to a “logic of racial domination” that shapes “the American rhetoric of equality” (xvi), as opposed to indicating a territorial project of expansion/incorporation in which governmental and jurisdictional authority is exerted over nonmem- ber polities who do not seek such belonging, and from this perspective, Native political projects (such as that of Mashpees in the 1830s, which I discuss in chapter 3) appear as the pursuit of “cultural autonomy” within the broader achievement of “civil rights” (162–68).¶ If an existing analytics of race produces distortion, what is the alternative? Or, approached from a slightly different angle, in addressing the implicit operation and reproduction of settler legalities in quotidian geographies of lived nonnative experience, what happens to the notion of whiteness? Work within Indigenous studies coming out of Anglophone settler-states other than the United States has foregrounded the role of whiteness as a principal mode through which settlement is realized and naturalized.31 In “White- ness, Epistemology, and Indigenous Representation,” Moreton-Robinson distinguishes “between a racialised subject position and the power and knowledge effects of racialised discourse,” positioning whiteness not simply as a particular embodied social location but as a means of naming the structure through which Indigenous territory comes to be understood as possessable by nonnatives and by which that logic of expropriation/ownership by the settler nation comes to be experienced as given (84). However, in the context of the United States, in which the de facto racial divide is not white/ Native but white/black, can whiteness provide the principal means of naming the operation of everyday formations and sensations of settlement? Moreton- Robinson suggests as much in “Writing off Treaties,” which addresses how whiteness studies in the United States takes the black/white binary as given in ways that efface settler colonialism and Indigenous dislocation: “The USA as a white nation state cannot exist without land and clearly defined borders, it is the legally defined and asserted territorial sovereignty that provides the context for national identifications of whiteness. In this way I argue Native American dispossession indelibly marks configurations of white national identity” (85). If racializing attributions of Indianness work as a way of displacing indigeneity, does that dynamic make settlement equiv- alent to whiteness or identification with it? Moreton-Robinson observes that “the sovereignty claims” of Indigenous peoples “are different from other minority rights at the center of the struggle for racial equality,” because “their sovereignty is not epistemologically and ontologically grounded in the citizenship of the white liberal subject of modernity” (87). Describing Native “dispossession” as marking “white national identity,” though, need not be the same as characterizing whiteness as the primary vehicle through which Indigenous “sovereignty claims” are disowned.¶ In other words, whiteness in the United States conventionally has signified in terms of a racial hierarchy through which populations’ access to citizenship rights and social wealth are managed, but given that all positions in that hierarchy are predicated on the continued existence of the settler- state, settlement may be conceptualized less as a function of whiteness than whiteness may be understood as expressing a particular privileged position within the allocation of Native lands and resources among nonnatives. As Scott Morgensen suggests, “Racialization under white supremacy will grant non-Natives distinct, often mutually exclusive, abilities to represent or enact settler colonial power. But all non-Natives still will differ in their experiences of settler colonialism from the experiences of Native peoples” (21).32 Put a little differently, if whiteness names the mechanisms by which settler land tenure and jurisdiction are legitimized, it may not be the same whiteness as that of the black/white binary, even if both are lived in the same body, such that people of color may enact and aspire to whiteness-as-settlement while still contesting whiteness-as-allocation-of-entitlements-within-citizenship.33 Moreover, settlement may itself not depend on a routing through whiteness. In Creole Indigeneity, Shona Jackson addresses the dynamics of belonging in Guyana, analyzing how black subjects make themselves “native” in the process of emancipation and producing a postcolonial national identity. Jackson suggests that engaging with the history of the Caribbean “requires the diffi- cult assessing of Creoles as themselves settlers,” adding that “we must begin to address the ways in which, in the Caribbean and even within settler states like the United States. . . , those brought in as forced labor (racialized capital) now contribute to the disenfranchisement of Indigenous Peoples” (3). Specifically, casting labor as nationalizing and nativizing allows formerly enslaved people to be narrated as having an intimate connection to the place of the state, a belonging made possible by the ongoing settlement of Native lands. Jackson argues, “[L]abor by formerly enslaved and indentured people is precisely what they are able to make into and reify as the new prior time of their belonging[,] . . . with which they supplant the prior time of Indige- nous peoples” (69). Doing so reaffirms the legitimacy and inevitability of the nation-state’s existence, which itself depends on the translation and effacement of Native governments and geographies. Yet, in Guyana and elsewhere in the Caribbean, articulations of national identity come from majority non- white populations, largely of African descent. For these reasons, it may analytically be more productive to refer to the process of settlement in other terms than as “whiteness,” especially in the U.S. context in which the latter de facto is understood as referring to a struggle within the nation-state rather than as one over the nation-state’s domestication of Indigenous peoples and territories.34¶ The operation of the United States as a settler-state cannot be under- stood in isolation from the naturalization of racial identities and racialized access to resources, particularly inasmuch as the privileging of whiteness shapes nonnatives’ experience of possession and personhood. However, for the reasons sketched above, I do not foreground race as the primary modality through which to conceptualize processes of settlement and the dynamics of settler phenomenology, even as I address the (racial) coding of Native people(s) as Indians as part of how nonnatives edit out indigeneity and settler occupation from their sensation of the ordinary.35 I seek to address the ways that the legalities of the settler-state shape everyday experiences of givenness for all nonnatives, such that antiracist projects (along with other articulations of opposition, as in the texts I address) can recycle those lived grids of intelligibility as a basis for their alternative imaginings. In addition, bracketing the methodological centrality of race, while still engaging with dynamics of racialization, works as a way of forestalling the gravitational pull of citizenship and analogy with African Americans as the means for approaching settler colonialism, while also potentially opening up my analyses to a comparative frame that addresses settler-states in which whites are not predominant.

Focusing only on the relationship between whiteness and blackness renders colonization of Native Americans invisible and prevents whiteness from being seriously challenged – only an analysis of both antiblackness and colonization of Indigenous folks, the permutation, can solve

**Moreton-Robinson 08**[[26]](#footnote-26)

The field of Whiteness studies is not a uniquely white enterprise, African Americans have commented on and written about whiteness since the early 1800s.7 African American scholarship has been influential, particularly the work of W. E. B. Du Bois and more recently Toni Morrison whose seminal text Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination challenged the naturalized whiteness of American literature by illuminating how the omnipresence of African Americans has historically shaped it. 8 She exposes the embedded racial assumptions that enable whiteness to characterize itself in the literary imagination in powerful and important ways. In her analysis of Hemmingway’s To Have and to Have Not, Morrison illustrates how black men and women were positioned as inferiors within his texts to prop up white masculinity.9 Morrison further suggests in “Black Matters” that the African American presence has also “shaped the body politic, the Constitution, and the entire history of the [USA] culture.”10 Indigenous peoples are outside the scope of Morrison’s analysis. Through the centering of the African American presence, **Native American texts that have challenged**, resisted **and affected** the American literary imagination, **politics**, history and the Constitution **remain invisible.** This silence is an interesting discursive move considering that the best-selling novels within the USA in the late eighteenth century were captivity narratives. And as Native American legal scholar Raymond Williams argues it was **the positioning of Indians as** incommensurable **savages** within the Declaration of Independence that **enabled “‘the Founders’ vision of America**’s growth and potentiality **as a new form of** expansionary **white racial dictatorship** in the world.”11 The most valuable contribution of Morrison’s work for my purposes is her thesis that “**blackness**,” whether real or imagined, services the social construction and application of whiteness in its myriad forms. In this way it **is utilized as a white epistemological possession**. Her work opens up a space for considering how this possessiveness operates within the whiteness studies literature to displace Indigenous sovereignties and render them invisible. WHITE POSSESSIVENESS **Most historians mark 1492** **as the year when imperialism began to construct the old world order by taking possession of other people**, their lands and resources. **The possessive nature of this enterprise informed** the development of a **racial stratification** process **on a global scale** that became solidified during modernity. **Taking possession of Indigenous people’s lands was a** quintessential **act of colonization and was tied to the transition from the Enlightenment to modernity**, which precipitated the emergence of a new subject into history within Europe. Major social, legal, economic and political reforms had taken place changing the feudal nature of the relationship between persons and property in the 16th and 18th centuries. “These changes centered upon the rise of ‘possessive individualism,’ that is, upon an increasing consciousness of the distinctness of each self-owning human entity as the primary social and political value.”12 Private ownership of property both tangible and intangible operated through mechanisms of the new nation state in its regulation of the population and especially through the law. By the late 1700s people could legally enter into different kinds of contractual arrangements whereby they could own land, sell their labor and possess their identities all of which were formed through their relationship to capital and the state. **A new white property owning subject emerged into history and possessiveness became embedded in everyday discourse** as “a firm belief that the best in life was the expansion of self through property and property began and ended with possession of one’s body.”13 Within the realm of intra-subjectivity possession can mean control over one’s being, ideas, one’s mind, one’s feelings and one’s body or within inter-subjectivity it can mean the act or fact of possessing something that is beyond the subject and in other contexts it can refer to a state of being possessed by another. Within the law possession can refer to holding or occupying territory with or without actual ownership or a thing possessed such as property or wealth and it can also refer to territorial domination of a state. At an ontological level **the structure of subjective possession occurs through the imposition of one’s will-to-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will**, thus it is open to being possessed. This enables the formally free subject to make the thing its own. Ascribing one’s own subjective will onto the thing is required to make it one’s property as “willful possession of what was previously a will-less thing constitutes our primary form of embodiment; it is invoked whenever we assert: this is mine.”14 To be able to assert ‘this is mine’ requires a subject to internalize the idea that one has proprietary rights that are part of normative behavior, rules of interaction and social engagement. Thus possession that forms part of the ontological structure of white subjectivity is reinforced by its sociodiscursive functioning. WHITE WRITING A number of texts have been written historicizing the acquisition of white identity and the privileges conferred by its status through a trope of migration, which is based on the assumption that all those who came after the white people had taken possession are the immigrants. **White possession of the nation works discursively** within these texts **to displace Native American sovereignties by disavowing that everyone else within the USA are immigrants** whether they came in chains or by choice. **The only displacement that is theorized is in relation to African Americans**. Theodore Allen’s work on how the Irish became white in America illustrates that the transformation of their former status as the blacks of Europe relied on their displacement by African Americans in the new country.15 David Roediger discusses how the wages of whiteness operated to prevent class alliances between working class whites and African Americans.16 Karen Brodkin’s excellent book on how Jews became white demonstrates that the lower status of African American workers enabled Jewish class mobility.17 Jacobsen illustrates that European migrants were able to become white through ideological and political means that operated to distinguish them from African American blackness.18 **The black/white binary permeates these analyses enabling tropes of migration and slavery to work covertly** in these texts **erasing the** continuing history of colonization and **the Native American** sovereign **presence**. **Blackness becomes an epistemological possession** that Allen, Roediger, Brodkin and Jacobsen deploy in analyzing whiteness and race, **which forecloses the possibility that the dispossession of Native Americans was tied to** migration and **the establishment of slavery** driven by the logic of capital. **Slaves were brought to America as the property of white people to work** the **land** that was **appropriated from Native America tribes**. Subsequently, migration became a means to enhance capitalist development within the USA. Migration, slavery and the dispossession of Native Americans were integral to the project of nation building. Thus **the question of how anyone came to be white or black in the U**nited **S**tates of America **is** inextricably **tied to the dispossession of the original owners** and the assumption of white possession. The various assumptions of sovereignty beginning with British ‘settlers’ the formation of individual states and subsequently the United States of America all came into existence through the blood-stained taking of Native American land. The USA as a white nation state cannot exist without land and clearly defined borders, **it is the** legally defined and asserted **territorial sovereignty that provides the context for national identifications of whiteness**. In this way I argue Native American dispossession indelibly marks configurations of white national identity. Ruth Frankenberg acknowledges in the introduction to her edited collection Displaying Whiteness that whiteness traveled culturally and physically, impacting on the formation of nationhood, class and empire sustained by imperialism and global capitalism. She wrote that notions of race were tied “to ideas about legitimate ‘ownership’ of the nation, with ‘whiteness’ and ‘Americanness’ linked tightly together” and that this history was repressed. After making this statement she then moves on to discuss immigration and its effects.19 Her acknowledgement did not progress into critical analysis that centered Native American dispossession, instead Frankenberg represses that which she acknowledges is repressed. Repression operates as a defense mechanism to protect one’s perception of self and reality from an overwhelming trauma that may threaten in order to maintain one’s self image. **Repressing** the history of **Native American dispossession works to protect the** possessive **white self from ontological disturbance.** **It is** far **easier to extricate oneself from** the history of **slavery if there were no** direct family and material **ties to its institution and reproduction.** However, **it is not as easy to distance one’s self from** a history of **Indigenous dispossession when one benefits everyday** from being tied to a nation that has and continues to constitute itself as a white possession. Within the whiteness studies literature whiteness has been defined in multiple ways. It is usually perceived as unnamed, unmarked and invisible, and often as culturally empty operating only by appropriation and absence.20 It is a location of structural privilege, a subject position and cultural praxis.21 Whiteness constitutes the norm operating within various institutions influencing decision making and defining itself by what it is not.22 It is socially constructed and is a form of property that one possesses, invests in and profits from.23 Whiteness as a social identity works discursively becoming ubiquitous, fluid and dynamic24 operating invisibly through pedagogy.25 What these different definitions of whiteness expose is that it is something that can be possessed and it is tied to power and dominance despite being fluid, vacuous and invisible to white people. However, these different **conceptualizations of whiteness**, which use blackness as an epistemological possession to service what it is not, **obscure the** more complex **way** that **white possession functions** sociodiscursively through subjectivity and knowledge production. As something that can be possessed by subjects it must have ontological and epistemological anchors in order to function through power. As a means of controlling differently racialized populations enclosed within the borders of a given society, white subjects are disciplined, though to different degrees, to invest in the nation as a white possession that imbues them with a sense of belonging and ownership. This sense of belonging is derived from ownership as understood within the logic of capital and citizenship. In its self-legitimacy, white possession operates discursively through narratives of the home of the brave and the land of the free and through white male signifiers of the nation such as the Founding Fathers, the ‘pioneer’ and the ‘war hero.’ **Against this stands the Indigenous sense of belonging, home and place** in its sovereign incommensurable difference. **[They Continue…]** Despite the colonial history of the United States and racializing Native Americans in popular culture, as the embodiment of ‘redness,’ the whiteness literature makes a racial demarcation between African Americans and Native Americans. That is **by making blackness synonymous with ‘race’ African Americans are placed in a reified position** within the literature. **This binary understanding** of ‘race’ **places the literature** in one sense **out of colonial history**. That is the theorizing about whiteness does not begin with nor center the appropriation of **Indigenous peoples’ lands and the continuing sovereignty struggles** with the US nation state. They **are**, but they are **marginalized** within the theories of race and whiteness offered by whiteness studies despite its political commitment to and epistemological engagement with white race privilege and power. **The conceptual links between the privileges** and benefits **that flow from** **American citizenship** **to Native American dispossession remains invisible**. **Instead slavery**, war **and migration are the narratives by which** the historically contingent positionality of **whiteness unfolds**. **This reflects a failure to address the** sociodiscursive **way that white possession functions to produce racism**. The racism attending the sociodiscursive nature of white possession informed the establishment of the Advisory Board of Race in 1997. President Clinton established this Board to counsel and inform him about race and racial reconciliation couching the terms of reference within a civil rights framework.44 No Native American representative was appointed to the Board even though they are the only racial group required to carry a blood quantum card as proof of tribal membership.45 This exclusion was the catalyst for numerous protests by different Native American groups. They stated that while Native Americans shared with other racial groups the need for improving their socioeconomic and legal conditions, there were other conditions not shared. They argued that their position within the USA was unique because of their sovereignties and treating with the Nation State. The racism that they experience is predicated on this relationship. Native American sovereignty is constantly under threat by the Nation State and its various mechanisms of governance such as the Plenary Powers of the United States Congress. **Within their daily lives they experience** the effects of **broken treaties, loss of land** **and** cultural rights, **genocide** and breaches of fiduciary duty. They are confronted by the constant battle with Congressmen and State Governors who wish to diminish their rights by framing “the economic and political empowerment of Indigenous tribes as evidence of a threatening tribal movement to transgress the temporal and spatial boundaries of colonial rule, consume American property and colonise the American political system.”46 Resisting and **diminishing Native American sovereignties** also **includes tactics such as positioning their claims outside racism which serves to** protect and **reinscribe** possessive investments in the nation as a **white possession**. Some twelve months after its establishment, President Clinton was invited to discuss his Race Advisory Board with a panel of eight people on a PBS broadcast. One member of the panel was Native American Sherman Alexie. The panel discussed with Clinton a number of race issues including affirmative action. During the show Clinton did not address Native American sovereignty claims but tried to connect with Alexie by informing him that his grandmother was one-quarter Cherokee. Later in the program Alexie was asked if he was often engaged by others in discussions about race to which he replied that a dialogue often takes place when he is approached by people who “tell me they’re Cherokee.”47 In other words people do not talk about racism to Alexie unless they claim some form of Indigeneity. Alexie’s comment serves to illustrate how Clinton tries to capitalize on a Native American ancestry by staking a possessive claim to a subject position that is not purely white in order to connect with his native brother while having excluded Native Americans from the Race Committee. Clinton can stake a possessive claim to Cherokee descent because there is no threat to his investment in his white identity, which carries a great deal of cultural capital enabling him to make the claim on biological grounds outside of Cherokee sovereignty. What Clinton was also signifying to the audience was that race does not matter: even a person of Cherokee descent can be President of the United States because this is the land of freedom, liberty and equality. A similar rhetorical strategy was also deployed in March 2008 by Barack Obama in his speech on race in Philadelphia, which was framed by the black/white binary operationalizing narratives of slavery and migration. Obama declared that slavery was the original sin in the making of the nation and it is the African American experience that dominates his speech though he acknowledges Latinos, Hispanics and refers to Native Americans once. His narrative on migration is reserved for white working and middle class people who he says feel they have not been privileged by their race, they have worked hard to build their dream but are now victims of globalization. Obama stakes a possessive claim to whiteness throughout this speech by discursively operationalizing an American dream which is beyond race. He stages this through an appeal to Christian principles, civil rights, patriotism, citizenship, liberty, freedom and equality noting that the Declaration of Independence was developed by men who “travelled across an ocean to escape tyranny and persecution.”48 The tyranny and persecution inflicted upon Native Americans and slaves by white male possessors who framed the constitution is disavowed by Obama, who epitomizes them as the bearers of freedom and liberty. Clinton’s executive and personal actions and Obama’s speech serve to negate Native American claims that race and racism were operating, when Indigenous peoples were dispossessed, and they continue to mark their everyday lives and sovereignty claims. The genealogy of racism toward Native Americans can be traced back to “Greek and Roman myths of warlike, barbarian tribes and biblical accounts of wild men cursed by God” which informed renaissance era travel narratives describing them as the embodiment of primitive human savagery.49 **Enlightenment theorists** such as Locke and Hobbes **developed their ideas of the state** of nature **utilizing the American Indian as** the quintessential example of “humanity living in its pure, unadulterated **savage** state.”50 **These ideas operated discursively to inform theories about the rights of man within** the context of the rise of **democracy relegating Indigenous people to a state of nature** without any sovereign rights. They continue to circulate **preventing Indigenous sovereignties from gaining recognition as** relevant and **alternative visions of differently constituted modernities** and global futures. The exclusion of Native Americans from the Race Committee correlates with their invisibility within the whiteness literature. **Native Americans are located outside ‘racism’ because U**nited **S**tates**’** **status as a former colony** and its current mode of colonization **is separated from its historical narrative** as being the land of liberty, freedom and equality.
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